

Also, petition of A. K. Botsford, B. L. Wilcox, A. M. Wilcox, C. N. Scofield, D. Scofield, E. M. Wilcox, L. M. Wilcox, Edwin Wilcox, M. E. Collins, Lyman Collins, I. M. M. Moody, Brad Wilcox, E. W. Wilcox, H. A. Stevens, Sherman Stevens, F. F. Harvey, W. B. Forney, A. M. Foster, George Walton, M. L. Phillips, C. A. Morehouse, M. C. Haggard, John Foster, M. H. Collins, and Ira Collins, all of Saranac Lake, N. Y., protesting against House bill 652, to provide for the closing of barber shops in the District of Columbia on Sunday; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of Kenneth W. Goldthwaite, Edward Krauss, C. A. McAfee, and H. F. Towner, of Saranac Lake, N. Y., protesting against House bill 6468, to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, resolution of Mrs. J. D. More, in behalf of Brier Hill Grange, No. 744, of Brier Hill, N. Y., in favor of a national prohibition amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of E. P. Mitchell, E. E. Barrett, H. P. Jefferson, Clayton Goslin, Milton Welch, George Cowles, John M. Flint, W. O. Daniels, Floyd S. Fenner, J. Fred Hoyt, Edwin Wilcox, and others, of Parishville, N. Y., favoring the passage of a national prohibition amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of T. J. Scofield, L. G. Scofield, M. H. Collins, L. Collins, M. E. Collins, I. M. Moody, E. M. Wilcox, L. M. Wilcox, A. M. Foster, George Walton, John Foster, M. L. Phillips, George A. Pratt, B. F. Moody, Sidney Smith, C. E. Doody, Allison Darr, jr., S. C. Smith, E. Hennessey, F. L. Hillman, M. C. Daniels, H. M. Swinger, Charles E. Bailey, D. C. McLane, G. M. Richardson, D. Kelley, Peter Bessette, and others, of Saranac Lake, N. Y., protesting against the passage of House bill 6468, to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Mrs. H. J. Potter, Mrs. M. Ling, Mrs. J. H. Cutler, J. B. Cutler, A. C. Randall, Mrs. S. W. North, Albert Forbes, and Mrs. Albert Forbes, of Newman; Millicent Lengfeld, Mrs. G. W. Lengfeld, G. W. Lengfeld, Mrs. Henry Packard, and W. M. Morrow, of Lake Placid, all in the State of New York, protesting against the passage of House bill 6468, to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Mrs. C. E. M. Edwards, Mrs. Edw. S. Dodds, Maude S. Learned, F. S. Gilliland, Fredrika H. Day, Alma M. Gilliland, Mrs. E. J. Robinson, J. G. McKinney, Mrs. Frank E. Tromblee, Mrs. George H. Rymers, Mrs. S. B. Miller, Mrs. M. A. Darby, Julia Joy, Mrs. L. G. Barton, Mrs. A. B. Chatterton, Mary P. Brown, and D. G. Barton, all of Plattsburg, N. Y., urging the passage of the Sisson resolution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Memorial of Chamber of Commerce of Los Angeles, Cal., favoring the building of a road to the summit of Mount Whitney, Cal.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of L. C. Gibbs, Los Angeles, Cal., against bills to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of W. D. Van Noctran and 2 other citizens of Los Angeles, Cal., favoring an appropriation of \$100,000 for the capture of Pancho Villa; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of Chamber of Commerce of Humboldt County, Cal., indorsing national and Pacific coast defense, etc.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Joseph Pedott and 53 others, of Los Angeles, Cal., against Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of Chamber of Commerce of Los Angeles, Cal., indorsing House bill 5806, to provide for the construction of the San Juan Railway in Colorado and New Mexico; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STINESS: Petition of citizens of West Warwick, R. I., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS: Petition of sundry citizens of Bowling Green, Ky., against passage of House bills 491 and 6468, to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: Petitions of citizens of Longmont, Colo., against House bills 491 and 6468, to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition of Board of Governors of India House, New York City, and citizens of the eleventh district of Massachusetts, favoring adequate preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WASON: Petitions of Men's Forum, representing 50 people, of the town of Bristol; the Nashaway Woman's Club, representing 300 people, of Nashua; the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, representing 35 people, of Nashua; the Mothers' Class of the First Congregational Church, representing 50 people, of Nashua; the Baptist Church, representing 45 people, of Peterboro; the Baptist Christian Endeavor Society, representing 34 people, of Peterboro; the Congregational Sunday School, representing 100 people, of Peterboro; and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, representing 24 people, of Peterboro, all in the State of New Hampshire, favoring the national constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of the Greenville Grange, of Greenville, N. H., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

MONDAY, April 3, 1916.

(Legislative day of Thursday, March 30, 1916.)

The Senate reassembled at 12 o'clock m., on the expiration of the recess.

NATIONAL DEFENSE.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12766) to increase the efficiency of the Military Establishment of the United States.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, on Thursday last in the speech which I delivered in the Senate I made some statements about the Du Pont Powder Co. This morning I received a letter from Mr. du Pont, the president of the company, somewhat explaining in reference to the statements I made. I think it is fair to myself and fair to Mr. du Pont that I should have his letter read at the desk and my answer to it, so that the Record may show both statements.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there is no objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

E. I. DU PONT DE NEMOURS & Co.,
Wilmington, Del., April 1, 1916.

Hon. OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: After reading what you said in the Senate Thursday bearing on our nitric-acid proposition I have reached the conclusion that you do not understand the position of this company.

We regret to take exception to your statements on the floor that we had endeavored to influence Congressmen against the Muscle Shoals proposition. We have never in any way, either directly or through Mr. Cooper, who was especially mentioned, made any such endeavor, nor has it been our intention to do so.

We do not desire to keep the Government of the United States, or any individual or corporation, from building a plant for fixation of atmospheric nitrogen. Nor are we soliciting the business of manufacturing nitric acid for the Government.

The United States is to-day in a position never before known to any nation. Among the greatest, it is alone in a condition of peace. Magnificent in its financial and commercial development, power, and strength, it is weak to the despair of its citizens, be they rich or poor, in its preparedness against outside attack. Never has there been more willingness to do, coupled with less power for the doing, than now. Never has there been greater necessity for mutual faith and for cooperation. Let, then, each man bear his part of the burden as best he can in the cause of preparedness.

Those in charge of E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. have conceived it their duty in this crisis to be that of performance and not of influence. We, who of necessity must be prominent in military affairs, are not the unbiased judges of the question of preparedness, its character and extent. Whatever may be our personal conviction of the overwhelming advantages of peace to our large commercial business against the smaller advantages of war to our lesser military interest, we could not escape from the suspicion of our fellow men if we were to attempt to advise preparedness. These facts have led us to stand for absolute neutrality in this discussion. Those who are and feel themselves unbiased in this question must decide the amount and character of preparation. It is for us to take action under their decision.

The European war brought to our company calls for assistance that few organizations have been made to face. To the response that has been made we may refer with pardonable pride. In October, 1914, when the first demands for powder came from abroad, our company had capacity to manufacture military explosives amounting to 10,000,000 pounds per annum; of this capacity about 50 per cent had remained idle for five years owing to the activities in manufacture of our own Government. In fact this surplus capacity was about to be abandoned. To-day we are manufacturing at an output of 375,000,000 pounds per annum, and every pound of material necessary for this vast production finds its source in our own United States excepting one item alone, nitrate.

The possible failure of the Chilean nitrate beds, whose lifetime is measurable in a few decades, has long led consumers to think of other sources of supply. The formation of oxides of nitrogen and of nitric acid from the air through the electric discharge has been long known, but those who turned to that source of commercial supply met with long discouragement; though in recent years nitrates for use in fertilizers have been made commercially through the use of cheap water power, it was not until the year immediately preceding the European war that nitric acid was produced in quantity, quality, and cost to compete with that made from Chilean nitrate.

The activity of our company in examining all possible sources of fixed nitrogen led to a careful examination of the successful processes of the Norwegian Nitrate Co., and we have made purchase of the patent rights and accumulated the necessary drawings, data, and information for the immediate installation of a nitric-acid factory from designs which have been proved commercially successful. We believe that these are the only plans and processes in existence on which a factory on a large and commercial scale can be produced to-day. While it is true that nitric acid is being made in Germany by processes unknown, it is neither proved nor even supposed that these processes are commercially satisfactory; more likely they are devised and maintained under military necessity.

Since the acquisition of the above-mentioned patents we have failed to find a satisfactory water power in the United States that is privately owned, and we have recognized existing laws of the United States which make prohibitory the development of water powers now under governmental control. On this account we turned abroad for the purpose of finding suitable power for our uses, and had well-nigh closed a contract for the use of a Canadian supply when the European war drew attention to the necessities of the United States and its position of extreme weakness in event of war. Our company is in a position of unique usefulness to the United States Government on the question of nitric-acid supply. It is essential that any source of material be kept alive and in healthy development in times of peace for use in times of war; otherwise failure of operation and lack of trained workmen are quick to depreciate the value of any organization, no matter how perfect. Our company alone can consume in times of peace for commercial use the enormous quantity of nitric acid that the United States Government must require for military use in times of war. This fact makes it imperative that our supply should be made available to the United States. Whether other auxiliary sources of supply are obtained or not is entirely apart from the concerns of our company. On this account we have crystallized our ideas as quickly as possible and have presented to the Secretary of War and at his assent to the United States Senate, through Senator SAULSBURY, a bill, the sole object of which is to make it possible for the Secretary of War, in conjunction with a suitable board of engineers, to grant water-power rights for the production of nitric acid under certain conditions. The bill gives to our company no rights that are not open for acquisition by other citizens and does not make it mandatory for the Secretary of War to deal with us or any other individual; nor does the bill interfere with the development of any other source of supply of nitric acid, nor with any other project at hand now or in the future. As a further safeguard, the Government is to have a call for the product of factories licensed under this bill either in times of peace or times of war, and the profit allowed to the manufacturer is to be decided by the Government alone. Notwithstanding these full powers the licensee is to provide all funds for construction under plans to be approved by Government officials. It is inconceivable that a supply of nitric acid could be more favorably obtained.

You must appreciate that the above presentation of our case leaves little cause for an accusation of "lobbying"; that is, for underhanded promotion of individual interests. Our company has no desire other than to fully exploit the information which it has in hand and has no wish to influence the decision of a question in which it has no right to interfere.

In closing, I must ask pardon for making so lengthy an explanation of our affairs. I have thought it important that you should be relieved of a misunderstanding which evidently exists in your mind. If any further information can be rendered by this company we shall cheerfully accept any calls made upon us.

Very sincerely,

PIERRE S. DU PONT,
President.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I ask that my letter in answer to Mr. du Pont's letter may be read at the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Mr. PIERRE S. DU PONT.
President E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.,
Wilmington, Del.

APRIL 3, 1916.

MY DEAR MR. DU PONT: I received your letter of the 1st of April today in reference to the speech I made on last Thursday in the United States Senate in reference to the Government of the United States building a nitrate plant.

Your letter says, "I regret to take exception to your statement on the floor that we had endeavored to influence Congressmen against the Muscle Shoals proposition." I made no such statement. I recognize that the possible water-power development at Muscle Shoals on the Tennessee River is very great and can be used by the Government or private individuals to great advantage, but not once since this question has been pending before the Congress have I advocated the proposition that the Government should go to Muscle Shoals for the development of its power or that Muscle Shoals should be turned over to any private corporation or individual for the development of that power. I have contended from the beginning that the Government of the United States should thoroughly investigate the question of the most available power for its own use and the most available methods for the manufacture of nitrogen, and that when it reached a conclusion through a board to act for the Government that then the facts in reference to the case should be laid before the Congress for its determination, so that you are edvently building a straw man at which to shoot when you assert that you have made no effort against the Muscle Shoals proposition. I am sure that you have not, as there has been no such proposition pending before the Congress.

The House bill and the proposals before the House committee sought to give the Government of the United States an opportunity to act in this matter after investigation and consideration. What I charged against your company was that it opposed the House proposals and the efforts being made to develop one or more of our great waterways for the use of the Government and for the Government to establish its own plant for the manufacture of nitrogen or nitrate acid.

I am glad to have the opportunity to give you the reasons why I made this statement. I have been advised by men whose credibility there is no reason whatever to doubt that Mr. Hugh L. Cooper, whom I have been informed has been in your employ and acting for you, stated that he was opposed to the House provisions relating to this subject and that he intended to defeat them. I have also been informed that Mr. Charles B. Landis, an employee of your company, has been in Washington and exerted his influence against the proposals in the House bill looking to the Government securing a supply of

nitrogen. I have also been informed that you had other agents fighting the proposition when it was pending before the House. I do not know whether these agents are opposing the amendment that I have offered in the Senate or not, and so stated in my speech on last Thursday. If Mr. Cooper was not in Washington opposing the provisions of the House bill, and if Mr. Charles B. Landis was not in Washington opposing the provisions of the House bill, and they will write letters to me to that effect, I will be glad to publish them in the Record. If you have had no agents opposing the House proposals on this subject and you will write a letter making that statement clearly and distinctly, I will be glad to have your letter published in the Record and will endeavor at the same time to get a statement from the gentlemen who advised me in reference to the situation as to their information in reference to the subject.

You state in another paragraph of your letter, "You must appreciate that the above presentation of our case leaves little cause for an accusation of 'lobbying'; that is, for underhanded promotion of individual interests." In my speech in the Senate I do not think that I said anywhere in the speech that you were "lobbying" or in any way reflected on the methods used by your company except in so far as the statement of fact that I made may have been a reflection on them. If you had agents in Washington opposing the House bill, then the statement contained in my speech is justified by the facts. If you did not have them in Washington and will furnish me with letters stating that fact under their own signatures and a statement from yourself, I will publish them in the Record on my own motion.

As to the second proposition, I stated in my speech on Thursday that I thought the Government of the United States should develop sufficient horsepower to be controlled by it to assure at all times an adequate supply of nitrogen in this country for governmental purposes, and I also stated that if the Government would not take the initiative in the matter I did not believe in obstruction and that I thought that the private corporations in the United States ought to be given an opportunity to do so. I have no objection whatever to your company developing a nitrogen supply for itself or securing available water power to do so, but I believe, first, that the Government of the United States ought to have the first opportunity to select from the available water powers of the United States to develop them for governmental uses, and, second, I do not know of any reason why your company or private corporations seeking to produce nitrogen for their personal profit should have any advantage over other business corporations in the United States.

The general dam bill has passed the Senate with certain restrictions to guard the public interests. I am in hopes that the bill will pass the House, and that before this Congress is over we will have legislation on the statute books that will authorize the development of the water power in this country in such a way that the interests of the public will be safeguarded and at the same time the terms may be sufficiently reasonable as to invite private capital to invest its money in this line of development. If this is done, you will have the same opportunity that your competitors or other business interests in the United States will have.

The bill that you propose to the Congress does not have the limitations in it nor does it guard the public interests in the way that the general dam bill does that recently passed the Senate.

As to the development of your process for making nitrogen, I am advised that it is not economical and available process for making nitric acid for powder and nitrogen for fertilizer both at the same time. Personally I am as much interested in the development of plants for the manufacture of nitrogen to develop fertilizer for the farmers of this country as I am in the manufacture of nitrate acid to furnish us our powder supply, although, of course, I recognize the powder supply is our first patriotic duty and first governmental obligation.

As to the pending legislation, the amendment I have offered to the Senate bill in no way advocates the cause of any corporation or individual, in no way proposes the development of any particular water power, in no way seeks to advance any particular process for the making of nitrogen. I merely propose to investigate as to what is the best process and as to what is the best water power that can be used. As to the lines on which the Government can avail itself of the use of a nitrogen process, and as to the cost of development and place of location of a hydroelectric plant, if this resolution becomes a law it will be open for your company to present your case to the Board of Army Engineers. If your company has the best one, I have no doubt that it will be adopted. If your plan is not practicable and feasible, and there is another plan which is more meritorious, I have no doubt that will be adopted, and I can not see where there can be any particular objection on the part of your company to the plan I have proposed, unless you are opposed to the proposition because you do not desire the Government to go into the business of developing its own water power or making its own nitrogen.

I am not one of those who indulge the habit of abusing private corporations. I have not the slightest desire or intention of dealing unfairly with your company. What I stated in my speech I then believed, and believe now, to be justified by fact. They were facts that the Congress of the United States and the public at large were entitled to know. If I have been mistaken in my statement of facts and you furnish me with the evidence to that effect, I shall be glad to correct it.

With kindest regards, I have the honor to be,

Very truly, yours,

O. W. UNDERWOOD.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I do not intend to discuss the question further at this time. I merely felt that it was justice to the Du Pont Powder Co. to publish their statement, and also to publish my answer to their letter.

I have not charged this company with any improper motive. I charged that its agents were endeavoring to defeat the legislation that was before the House looking to the Government of the United States establishing a water-power and a nitrate plant for the Government's own use.

The statements I made were based on statements coming from reputable men. I have stated in my letter to Mr. du Pont that if the men whom I have named on the floor of the Senate and in those letters will write letters over their own signatures and deny the facts to me I will present their letters at the desk and have them read in justice to them. If they do not write such letters and deny the facts that I have stated, it will be a

confession on the part of the Du Pont Co. that the facts I stated in my speech on last Thursday are true.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair begs the indulgence of the Senate for one moment. The present occupant of the chair recognizes the fact that the Senate is a self-governing body, and that the rules are most generally "more honored in the breach than the observance"; but the Chair is about to assume that the Senate would like the following rule enforced:

No Senator shall interrupt another Senator in debate without his consent; and to obtain such consent he shall first address the presiding officer. And no Senator shall speak more than twice upon any one question in debate on the same day without leave of the Senate, which shall be determined without debate.

In the consideration of the pending bill in the last week that rule has been constantly violated. It has been done through what is known as senatorial courtesy, and the Senator holding the floor has been compelled to have his remarks interrupted by another Senator speaking upon an entirely different subject. The Chair is going to enforce the rule which he has just read until the Senate informs the Chair that it shall not be done.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, so far as I am personally concerned, I should like to see the rule enforced in order that we may expedite the business of the Senate if we intend to get through this summer.

Mr. President, the pending amendment is that offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] proposing to add five officers of the National Guard to the General Staff of the Army. I feel that it is my duty, as the temporary spokesman for the Committee on Military Affairs, to oppose this proposed addition to the General Staff. I want to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that this same proposition was involved in the bill that was reported to the House of Representatives by the House Committee on Military Affairs; it was involved before the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate; and both of those committees reported adversely to the adding of the officers of the National Guard to the General Staff of the Army.

Mr. President, I want to say in the outset that I am not unfriendly to the National Guard. I served four years as an officer in the National Guard, and I have always felt deeply interested in the work of that splendid and patriotic organization in my State, and in all of the States of the Union, as a matter of fact. It is true, as has been a number of times stated upon the floor of the Senate, that they have given their time without pay, and have diligently undertaken to fit themselves for the service of their country, sometimes at very great sacrifice, and nobody realizes that more than do I because of my association with that organization for a number of years.

So our committee, Mr. President, approached the discussion of this subject in no unfriendly way. But the discussions on the floor of the Senate have convinced this body that the status of the National Guard under the Constitution of the United States has never been determined, and there is nearly as great contrariety of opinion upon the subject as there are Senators. Some, like the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], than whom there is no abler exponent of the Constitution in this body, insists that it is impossible practically to nationalize the National Guard so as to bring it under the control of the Central Government. I state that as a general outline of the Senator's claim. On the other hand, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], who is also a very distinguished and learned lawyer, claims that it is possible to so federalize the National Guard of the country as to make them a Federal force almost as immediately subject to the control of the War Department as are the regular forces themselves. I am rather in line with the view of the Senator from Iowa. I think if the Congress of the United States will exhaust the powers it has under the Constitution, that we can very nearly approximate a federalization of the National Guard; but I realize that that is a very debatable question.

Able lawyers have insisted that the National Guard might be federalized in everything except the appointment and control of the officers of the National Guard, it being insisted that such officers must be appointed by the governors of the States, and that Congress can not interfere to control the appointment of officers.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I wish to ask has the Senator from Oregon heard any lawyer claim that Congress can authorize the President to order the militia of the States into the service of the United States for the purpose of training?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. No; I do not believe I have.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. So that it is not simply that the Federal Government can not appoint the officers of the militia of the States, but that the Federal Government can not constitutionally compel the State militia to enter the service of the United States to train them; and the power of training them is reserved to the several States under the same clause of the Constitution by which the power to appoint the officers is reserved to the several States.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I do not propose to enter into the discussion of the constitutional question at all, because it has been so ably discussed by others. I am going to address myself more particularly to the pending question, leaving, for the present at least, the constitutional question to be discussed by Senators on the floor of the Senate; but I will say, in answer to the Senator from Connecticut, that it is contended by many Senators, and by the Senator from Iowa amongst others, that the training to which the Senator refers is training by the States under the discipline prescribed by the Congress itself, so that, if that contention be carried to its farthest limits, it is a part of the discipline that Congress has power to prescribe that the States must pursue in training the militia. I do not know how far Congress can go in this behalf.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I observe what the Senator from Oregon says, but right at that point—and I shall not interrupt the Senator again—I desire to state that, in my opinion, the discipline—

The VICE PRESIDENT. We are starting in wrong now, in that the Senator from Connecticut is expressing his views instead of asking a question.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. If it is so that a Senator can not make a statement in the process of making an inquiry, I shall put it in this form: I will ask if the Senator from Oregon will yield for that purpose?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Does the Senator from Oregon think, from the fact that the Constitution uses the word "disciplining" and also uses the word "training," that there is a distinction between those things? And does the Senator think that "the discipline" to be "prescribed by Congress" is a statement of the kind of training that the National Guard shall have but is not at all the process of training?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. If Congress undertakes to lay down a rule for the discipline of the State militia and they are to be trained pursuant to that regulation, whatever it may be, great or small, it seems to me that they might have the power practically to lay down rules for the training of the troops in the States themselves. But I do not intend to discuss that question, Mr. President.

I want to express very great regret that the National Guard of the several States, after having been patiently heard, through its representative officers, in the committees of the House and Senate, and after a most painstaking hearing on the part of these committees, has seen fit to inject itself into the Halls of Congress, until now it looks very much as though it were a fight between the Regular forces of this country or, rather, those who believe in maintaining a Regular Establishment for the defense of this country, and the National Guard, as to which is to be considered in legislation which affects the whole country. I am not going to limit that criticism, Mr. President, to the National Guard. I want my position to be fully understood about this matter. I have with the Military Affairs Committee devoted nearly three months of my time to working just as hard as I know how, and this bill, as I have explained heretofore, has run the gamut of the department here in Washington, including the General Staff, the War College, and all the other military departments of the Government. We have had the views of the representative men of these bodies, and after we have undertaken to formulate a bill which seemed, in the committee at least, to meet pretty generally the approval of the authorities, we find that not only the National Guard and its officers—and I sometimes fear a lobby is maintained for that purpose—but we find officers of the Army around the Halls of the Senate and House of Representatives interfering with this legislation instead of leaving the matter to Congress, who have the matter in hand and are responsible for the legislation affecting the Army, until, Mr. President, the work is like Pelion on Ossa piled. The work of the committees of this Congress amounts to nothing if men representing the National Guard and men representing the different branches of the Army as well are to be permitted to come here and interfere with the due course of legislation. I do not mean to say that it is a dishonest interference, but it certainly is impeding and interfering with legislation. I regret very much this condition. I have sometimes felt that I ought to call the attention of the War Department to the situation here, and I may do so later.

With reference to the representation of the National Guard on the General Staff, I hope the amendment will not be adopted; because, as I said a while ago, the status of the National Guard from a constitutional viewpoint is undetermined. The committee, feeling friendly to the National Guard, has gone the limit—and I sometimes fear has trod upon the heels of the Constitution—in undertaking to make it a federalized force. We

have not only undertaken to make it a Federal force, but we have undertaken to limit the power of the appointment of officers by the governors of the States, requiring that selections for appointment shall be made under rules determining the capacity of these men. Whether that can be done or not I do not pretend to say with certainty, but we have tried it.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President—

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. If the Senator will pardon me a moment, we have tried it for the purpose of enabling the National Guard to have its status determined as a dependable force in time of emergency.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. If the Senator will permit me to interrupt him, I desire to ask him a question; but it is necessary that I should say a single word as a foundation for the question.

I sympathize with the views expressed by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] as to the interpretation of the Constitution, but I also sympathize with the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] with reference to providing representation on the General Staff for the National Guard. Now, I want to ask the Senator from Oregon whether he sees any constitutional difficulty in the way of the amendment which the Senator from Iowa proposes.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Frankly, I do not. I think it might be constitutionally done; but I am going to show, Mr. President that it ought not to be done, in view of the recognition which is now given by the laws of Congress to the National Guard, and I am going to address myself to that subject for a few moments.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I shall listen to the Senator with much interest, because that is a matter about which I am very much concerned.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. What are the functions of the General Staff? From a compilation of the laws and regulations governing the General Staff, I find that the general staff of all armies is composed of military experts in various lines, whose duty it is to make studies on military subjects, to examine projects and proposals for the improvement of the army in all lines, to plan for the instruction of the forces, to recommend upon questions of military policy, to make plans for possible military exigencies, to study geography and various areas in our own and other countries, and to collect and arrange military information concerning foreign countries.

It has been the practice of all governments to select their best military experts for service on the general staff. Our General Staff is a mere bagatelle in numbers as compared with some of the general staffs of the armies now engaged in the war in Europe. Not only are they advised as to conditions in their own country from a military standpoint, but they are advised about the conditions in our country; and newspaper discussion and some discussions on the floor of the Senate have convinced me that they know more about our own Military Establishment and our military conditions than our people do themselves.

It will be seen from an examination of the duties of the General Staff that they are all technical and require to the highest degree a knowledge of the military art. If this proposed amendment is passed, it will inject into the General Staff a body of men whose knowledge of military matters must be small, because the study of the military art has been an avocation with them and not a vocation, as is the case with the professional soldier. Their usefulness will be, in the very nature of things, limited; and the committee could not see that the services returned to the Government would be at all commensurate with the cost involved in their pay and allowances. The General Staff is not a partisan body nor a political body, and to detail a certain number of officers from the militia, with the avowed intention of giving them representation, would be to inject a new principle into the General Staff and would constitute a most unfortunate precedent.

There are apparently, as I suggested a while ago, some erroneous views in regard to the General Staff and its duties; for the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. LEE] seemed to think that if they had a fixed status on the General Staff, information which was sought by him from the War Department might have been furnished very much more quickly than he was able to get it. The fact that the Secretary of War prevented the War College from giving out certain information is a matter of policy to be determined by that official, and has nothing to do with the General Staff.

Judging from his address the other day, the Senator from Maryland seemed to be under a misapprehension as to the functions of the General Staff as to mobilization, and appeared to think, if I did not misconstrue what he said, that having cer-

tain members of the National Guard on the General Staff would facilitate these plans. Mobilization consists in the transformation of the Military Establishment from its status of peace to that of war, and has to do with the formation of the field army recruited to full strength, armed, quipped, and provided with transportation for field service, the formation of reserves to reinforce it, the formation of depots of recruits to replace its losses, the plans for the occupation of vacated garrisons, and the organization of the auxiliary service necessary to maintain the combatant force in a high state of efficiency. This mobilization is effected without loss of time if a proper plan of mobilization has been prepared in advance; and I will say, Mr. President, that the general staff corps of other armies, in addition to the work that they have done at home, have maps and plans and diagrams and everything formulated for the future in case of conflict with some other power. I may say that information has recently come to me to the effect that the general staff of a certain one of the belligerents has every bit of the information, diagrams, and plans necessary for the movement of troops in case we happened to have any differences with that particular belligerent.

So that the duties of the general staff of an army are of the highest technical importance, and ought not to be considered except by the best experts that an army can furnish. Let me say here that in the organization of our General Staff, so jealous have they been with reference to the naming of men on the staff that the Secretary of War details five general officers who act under oath and select men for the General Staff—the experts of the Army, not below the rank of captain. These experts are the men who are selected for General Staff duty; and they are chosen for their peculiar fitness for any particular branch of the service.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to ask him a question there?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Certainly.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Does the Senator understand that if officers of the State militia or of the so-called National Guard—and I believe the Dick Act provides that all these organizations, by whatever name they have been previously known, shall in the future be known officially as the Organized Militia—if officers of the Organized Militia are made members of the General Staff by act of Congress, would that subject them to the military discipline of the United States Regular Army as to court-martial, and the entire regular military discipline?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I think the purpose of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] was distinctly to have that done, because he feels that it can be done; but there is a difference of opinion amongst the Senators about that, and that is one of the reasons why I say that this amendment ought not to be adopted—because of the difference of opinion, not only amongst the Senators, but among the courts of the country as well.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Oregon a question?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Certainly.

Mr. CUMMINS. Does not the bill that he has reported so provide?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. It does. We have tried to do it.

Mr. CUMMINS. I have therefore simply proceeded upon the basis of the bill which the committee has reported.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I realize that. I am not criticizing the Senator's position, as I am largely in accord with him; but my difference with the Senator grows out of this fact: He would put on the General Staff, which has for its purpose all of these plans that I am discussing, representatives of the National Guard, who in the very nature of things have not been in a position to learn how to do this work that is required of the General Staff in any army. I say that without intending to discredit these gentlemen. As I say, I was a member of the National Guard myself; but I realize, as most of the Senators here realize, that it is a physical impossibility for members of the guard, in the short time they have, to learn as much about all of these questions as those who make the Army a profession in life from the time they leave the Military Academy until they retire for old age.

Speaking of the other duties of the General Staff, the mobilization to which I referred a while ago is effected without loss of time if a proper plan of mobilization has been prepared in advance; but the preparation of this plan deals entirely with technical subjects and not at all with the class of soldiers composing the Army. Each man, each company, and the regiment is a unit, and merely considered as a unit, and not as to whether it is a Regular unit, a National Guard unit, or a Volunteer unit. It is not apparent how the acquaintance of the National Guard

officers with their peculiar organizations—for that is the argument that is made here—would be of any benefit in the preparation of a plan for mobilization.

One of the Senators insisted that if the National Guards were represented on the General Staff many of the difficulties which attend the transportation of troops from one point to another would be avoided. I do not understand that that is a part of the general plan of the General Staff. It is their duty to say where troops should be mobilized and not how the mobilization should be effected. That is done through other instrumentalities than the General Staff. If they say, from the plans they have worked out as affecting the war, that the troops should be mobilized at a certain point along the Mexican border, that is the thing that is done and accepted as a part of the program of the War Department. How to get them there does not necessarily come within the general scope and purpose of the General Staff, except in so far as they have formulated maps and plans showing the railroads, the methods of reaching certain points where mobilization is to be had, and so forth. The only necessary thing is that the individuals on the General Staff should have a thorough knowledge of the military art and not that they should come from any particular source.

The distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. LEE] speaks about the mobilization of the Swiss forces in 10 days, and says that her mobilization was more prompt than that of Germany. This is undoubtedly a fact; but it must be remembered that the principal reason therefor is that Switzerland is a country about the size of Vermont and New Hampshire, whereas Germany and France are each about the size of Texas and the United States stretches as far as from Portugal almost to Siberia and from England to Persia.

On questions affecting policies regarding the treatment of the National Guard and for presenting their views to the Secretary of War, the National Militia Board already exists, and will remain in existence under the terms of the bill. The questions that come up for the consideration of its members are few in number, and they can always be called together by the Secretary of War to advise on such matters.

I am going to call attention to that now, Mr. President. I want to show that the National Guards of the country have representation now for all purposes required to bring them in touch with the War Department and the General Staff.

Section 1337 of the military laws of the United States provides:

The Secretary of War is hereby authorized to appoint a board of five officers on the active list of the Organized Militia, so selected as to secure, as far as practicable, equitable representation to all sections of the United States, and which shall from time to time, as the Secretary of War may direct, proceed to Washington, D. C., for consultation with the Secretary of War respecting the condition, status, and needs of the whole body of the Organized Militia. Such officers shall be appointed for the term of four years, unless sooner relieved by the Secretary of War.

Mr. President, pursuant to that, this board of National Guard officers has been appointed, and acts in conjunction with the Secretary of War. There is not a single need of the National Guard that can not be brought immediately to the attention of the Secretary of War just as effectively, if not more effectively, than it would be possible to bring it to his attention through the instrumentality of representatives of the National Guard on the General Staff. In other words, Mr. President, until the status of the National Guard has been determined beyond any question of doubt, it seems to me that they ought not to be added to a board which has peculiar functions of a technical nature to perform, and which, in the very nature of things, officers of the National Guard are not in a condition to perform.

I attained the rank of a captain of the National Guard. The lowest grade of the General Staff Corps is that of captain. I am frank to say that after four years of service as a member of the National Guard—and I think I had ordinary intelligence in undertaking to learn the duties of an officer—I would have been powerless to master the technique necessary to say where the troops of the United States should have been mobilized and mass in a given emergency for the purpose of a proper defense of this country. In the very nature of things, Mr. President, practicing law, as I was, engaged in the civil walks of life, I could not devote to the duties of that place the time required to master the details of all of these great questions.

Let me say here that Gen. Mills—who is at the head of the Division of Militia Affairs, and in holding that office a member of the General Staff, and a very painstaking man—has gone into all this subject very fully, and I invite the attention of Senators to his report. I want to say here, Mr. President, because the suggestion has been made in two or three quarters that the Army is opposed to the National Guard, that I have never at any time found a disposition upon the part of any

Army officer to attempt to discredit the National Guard, or to do anything that would make it less effective. On the contrary, my experience is that they have tried to bring it into closer touch with the regular forces of the United States, so that in case of emergency it could be readily made available and efficient. I do not know what the experience of others may have been. We had a distinguished officer of the Engineer Corps detailed with us by the War Department to assist us in the use of the proper technical language in framing this bill, and we had with us a distinguished retired officer of the United States Army; and I have never seen two gentlemen of any body of men listen more patiently to the suggestions of the National Guard and try harder than these gentlemen did to assist in carrying out the wishes of the National Guard and making it an effective body under the control of the War Department. The only questions that ever arose in the minds of these gentlemen were the same questions that have arisen in the minds of the distinguished Senators here, and they were discussed without prejudice, and fairly. That was the fact about it. And so, whenever I have called into requisition the services of any Army officer in the preparation of this bill, they were all anxious to do what? To create a force, first, of the Regular Army, and then an efficient force of National Guardsmen or Volunteers that might be drawn upon whenever the emergencies of the country required some force to be called upon—and, God knows, we all realize the necessity of it.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Certainly.

Mr. OVERMAN. Was there any demand before the committee on the part of the National Guard that they should have representation on the General Staff?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Oh, yes. Both committees passed on it—the committee of the House and the committee of the Senate.

Mr. OVERMAN. And both declined?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Both declined. We passed on nearly every question that is going to be submitted here, Mr. President. After having given patient attention to the hearings that were had before those committees and having undertaken impartially to reach a conclusion that would be best not for the National Guard and not for the Army, but for the country, we find all of these men and branches of the different services here beseeching the Congress to undo what the committee has done and to formulate a piecemeal statute that will be ineffective in time of stress and storm. The purpose of the committee has been—and I hope the purpose of the Senate will be—to ignore the demands of special interests, whether in the Army or in the National Guard, and undertake to reach a conclusion which will help our country rather than individuals.

Mr. President, I am going to ask to have inserted in the RECORD a diagram that has been prepared with great care to show the peace organization and administration of the office of the Chief of the Division of Militia Affairs. It shows, Mr. President, briefly and succinctly, just exactly how the National Guard, under the present system, is brought in touch with the Regular Establishment and exactly what are the functions that are to be performed; and it shows further that under the system as it now exists the National Guard is just as nearly in touch with the War Department as is possible to make it by placing members of the National Guard on the General Staff not to benefit the General Staff, but to impair the efficiency of the work of the General Staff.

I ask that this statement may be printed in connection with my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Then, too, I desire to insert in the RECORD from the Congressional Directory, under the head "Department of War," a short statement in regard to the Division of Militia Affairs. It is a compact statement of the duties of the Division of Militia Affairs and will save the Members of the Senate time in trying to trace them up. The rules and regulations governing the Militia Board are quite long. I call the attention of the Senate to the Organized Militia Regulations of the War Department, an authoritative publication issued by the War Department, article 8 of which sets out the rules and regulations governing the National Guards of the country. But the statement that I desire to have inserted in the RECORD is found at page 301 of the Congressional Directory:

DIVISION OF MILITIA AFFAIRS.

The Division of Militia Affairs is vested with the transaction of business pertaining to the organized and unorganized militia of the United States, its jurisdiction embracing all administrative duties involving the armament, equipment, discipline, training, education, and organization of the militia; the conduct of camps of instruction and

PEACE ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF THE OFFICE OF THE CHIEF, DIVISION OF MILITIA AFFAIRS.

Chief of division.

Brigadier General, General Staff.

In charge of all business of the War Department pertaining to the organized and unorganized militia of the United States, embracing all administrative duties involving the armament, equipment, discipline, training, education, and organization of the militia, the conduct of camps of instruction, the participation of the Organized Militia in field exercises and maneuvers of the Regular Army, mobilization and relations of the militia to the Regular Army in time of peace, and all other matters pertaining to the militia which do not, under existing laws, regulations, orders, or practice, come within the jurisdiction of the General Staff or any division or bureau of the department. Is responsible for the records of all matters pertaining to the militia when not in the military service of the United States and is the channel of communication between the Secretary of War and the adjutants general of the States, Territories, and the District of Columbia, in relation to business pertaining to the militia when not in the military service of the United States.

Principal assistant to Chief of division.

Colonel, Infantry.

Assistant and executive officer of the division, in charge of the general subject of organization.

Assistant to the chief of division.	Assistant to the chief of division.	Assistant to the chief of division.	Assistant to the chief of division.	Assistant to the chief of division.	Assistant to the chief of division.	Assistant to the chief of division.	Assistant to the chief of division.	Assistant to the chief of division.
Lieutenant colonel, Infantry.	Major, Medical Corps.	Major, Field Artillery.	Major, Corps of Engineers.	Captain, Coast Artillery Corps.	Captain, Quartermaster Corps.	Captain, Cavalry.	Captain, Infantry (Signal Corps).	First lieutenant, Infantry.
In charge of matters pertaining to the organization and instruction of the Infantry personnel of the Organized Militia.	In charge of matters pertaining to the organization and instruction of the sanitary personnel of the Organized Militia.	In charge of matters pertaining to the organization and instruction of the Field Artillery personnel of the Organized Militia.	In charge of matters pertaining to the organization and instruction of the Engineer personnel of the Organized Militia.	In charge of matters pertaining to the organization and instruction of the Coast Artillery personnel of the Organized Militia.	In charge of matters pertaining to property and financial matters pertaining to the Organized Militia, the equipment of organizations of all arms, and issues to States.	In charge of matters pertaining to the organization and instruction of the Cavalry personnel of the Organized Militia.	In charge of matters pertaining to the organization and instruction of Signal Corps and machine-gun organizations of the Organized Militia and matters of personnel relating to sergeant-instructors.	Assistant to the officer in charge of matters pertaining to the organization and instruction of the Infantry personnel and in charge of matters pertaining to target practice of the Organized Militia.

Chief clerk of the division.

In general charge of all clerical work of the division and responsible to the chief of the division for the general character and quantity of the work performed.

Assistant chief clerk.

In the absence of the chief clerk he will perform the duties assigned to the latter; will examine all papers prepared for the action of the chief of the division which are checked to his basket by the chiefs of section and check them to the chief clerk's basket; and will perform such other work in connection with the general work of the office as may be assigned to him by the chief clerk.

Correspondence section.	Record section.	Financial section.	Property section.	Statistical section.	Blank room.
One chief of section (assistant chief clerk) and six clerks. Will perform such stenographic work as the business of the office may demand under the supervision of the chief of section and chief clerk.	One chief of section and five clerks. The work of this section consists of the receiving and mailing of all correspondence of the office, the searching of records for previous correspondence or relevant cases; the briefing, indexing, and filing thereof.	One chief of section and two clerks. Will keep books of accounts between the War Department and the Organized Militia; draw requisitions for funds; examine and record the accounts of disbursing officers, and check auditor's settlement thereof with the accounts and books of the office.	One chief of section and two clerks. Will act on all requisitions for supplies received from the several States, including the preparation of correspondence relating thereto.	One chief of section and five clerks. Will examine reports of inspections, of small-arms firing, and annual returns of strength; will prepare statistical matter for the annual report of the Chief of the Division of the Organized Militia; make requisitions for supplies for the division, and examine and act on survey proceedings and property accounts and returns.	One clerk and one messenger, who will make distribution of general orders, bulletins, circulars, blank forms, etc., to the Organized Militia.

participation in the field exercises and maneuvers of the Regular Army; the mobilization and relations of the militia to the Regular Army in time of peace; the preparation of annual returns of the militia required by law to be submitted to Congress; and all matters pertaining to the militia not herein generically enumerated which do not, under existing laws, regulations, orders, or practice, come within the jurisdiction of any other division or bureau of the War Department. It is the central office of record for all matters pertaining to the militia not in the military service of the United States.

Now, so much for that.

Mr. President, I am not going to indulge in any severe strictures of the National Guard, because I can not repeat too often that I feel friendly to them and I want to see them made a strong and effective force, and I have attempted to do all in my power to make them so.

Some National Guards of this country are splendid bodies of troops. Take the New York National Guard, for instance. I have never seen them in action, but they are under the control of Maj. Gen. O'Ryan, a very distinguished and a very able gen-

tleman, a man who is paid a good salary by the State and who is to all intents and purposes a professional soldier, because he makes that his business. He is trying to make the National Guard a strong force, a commanding force, and he has come as near doing it as almost any man in the United States. He was before our committee and testified not only as a soldier but as a constitutional lawyer, and he has been of great assistance in preparing a bill. I might speak in the same way about other guardsmen and guards, but I individualize for the purpose of illustration.

Mr. DU PONT. I should like to ask the Senator from Oregon if it is not a fact that a large portion of the provisions in the bill with respect to the militia were suggested or certainly approved by Maj. Gen. O'Ryan?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Oh, yes; I think probably it is safe to say that nearly all of them have been approved by representatives of the National Guard. But they do not stop with

those; they want more. I think I heard the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] speak once about a man who on a certain occasion, familiar to us all, called for "beef! beef! more beef!" Our friends of the guard are not satisfied with what we have attempted to do for them to carry out what they profess to want, federalization, Federal control, but they want more. They want more than the safety of this country would warrant Congress in giving them. Now, I am not going, as I said a while ago, to call attention to the delinquencies of the National Guard. They are not professional soldiers. But I do ask Senators to read the impartial statement of Gen. Mills in the House hearings, volume 2, at page 187. I am not going to discuss it. I merely want the Senate to read it and be advised from authoritative sources, and I call the attention of Senators to the report of Gen. Mills.

In the very nature of things these distinguished gentlemen of the guard, however honest they may be and however capable in their ordinary avocations of life, are not competent to handle these technical questions as to the duties of the soldier in the time they devote to training themselves for the service of their country.

Mr. President, without having the figures right before me, I call your attention to the fact that over a million dollars' worth of property that has been turned over by the General Government to the National Guard has been lost. Scandals have grown out of the handling of it. It has been charged that uniforms condemned by officers of the National Guard have been sold for the troops of other countries.

I am not impeaching the general personnel of the National Guard, but I am calling attention to conditions which have grown out of the policy in dealing with the National Guard and the properties of the Government turned over to them. Yet it is proposed to transfer these patriotic and distinguished gentlemen from places where there have been abuses to higher places where still other and greater and higher trusts might be abused.

Not only that, but in the adoption of plans for the mobilization of troops and other matters in time of emergency, not only is the property of the Government at stake, but the lives of the men of the Army as well. Shall we place upon the General Staff men who lack experience in the details necessary to successfully work out these great questions and problems?

Mr. President, there are a number of other questions that have been discussed here. I shall take them up as we reach them. One of these is the volunteer force that my distinguished friend from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] spoke of as an intermediary force slipped into this bill for some sinister purpose. I shall discuss it when we come to it and show the genesis of that provision. It is not true, as the Senator said, that it had its suggestion in some unpatriotic suggestion of anybody. It was recommended by Washington and by nearly every general who has had anything to do with the organization of troops. I shall call the attention of the Senate to that when we reach it, but the matter now before the Senate is the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa to add to the General Staff of the Army five officers of the National Guard.

Mr. President, I do hope that the Senate will not adopt that amendment. We have increased the General Staff from 34, I believe, to 88 officers. Still it is small as compared with the general staff of the German Army; it is small as compared with the general staff of the French Army; it is small as compared with the general staff of the British Army; and if there is anything that Britain has been brought to realize in the terrible struggle going on in Europe it is the necessity of a general staff of long-established reputation to arrange for the future plans for mobilization and other kindred subjects for the conduct of her armies.

Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to some of the work that is being done by the General Staff, the purely technical character of work that that body is doing.

The War College division of the General Staff is at work all the time studying not only international questions in connection with the Army, but the War Establishment locally as well. I have in my hand some of the papers that have been prepared by the Army War College division of the General Staff discussing questions like these, for example:

The militia as organized under the Constitution and its value to the Nation as a military asset.

Study on places of origin and ability to procure supplies needed in vast quantities in time of war.

Personnel versus matériel in plans for national defense.

The pension roll as affected by the War with Spain in 1898.

Outline of plan for military training in public schools of the United States.

Organization, training, and mobilization of Volunteers under the act of April 25, 1914.

Organization, training, and mobilization of a reserve for the Regular Army.

1. Organization, training, and mobilization of a force of citizen soldiery. 2. Method of training a citizen army on the outbreak of war to insure its preparedness for field service—

And papers on many other kindred subjects. I will not read further, but they all cover technical questions, and they ought not to be entrusted to men who have not had military education and training such as is necessary to make them efficient and proficient in the discharge of these highly important duties.

It would very much weaken the Army, Mr. President, I think, to go further than the Senate committee has attempted to go in the preparation of this bill with respect to the National Guard. It would very much weaken the Army, it seems to me, to elevate gentlemen from the National Guard into positions on the General Staff, and I do hope that the Senate will vote down the amendment proposed to the bill as reported by the committee.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I rise for the purpose of making a parliamentary inquiry, which is this: The Chamberlain bill, so called, which is now under consideration, is reported, as I understand it, as a substitute for the so-called Hay bill, which came over from the House. Certain committee amendments to the Chamberlain bill have also been recommended by the committee. Are those committee amendments, which have been recommended, themselves subject to amendment during the consideration of the Chamberlain bill as a substitute for the Hay bill?

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is not any doubt in the mind of the Chair as to what the rules are and as to the status. The Senate committee has moved to strike out the entire Hay bill and substitute another bill in its place. The other day, by a motion made directly in violation of the rules of the Senate, which are that when there is a pending question to strike out and to insert each is subject to amendment, but that the portion to be stricken out is first to be amended and the portion to be substituted is thereafter to be amended, it was decided that the substitute was to be first amended. On that question the Chair cares nothing whatever, but when amendments are submitted by the committee to the committee amendment the Chair has no doubt that each Senator may offer to amend the amendment.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. That answers my question. I asked it because I had introduced a proposed amendment to a committee amendment, and if the ruling of the Chair was to be otherwise I desired to redraft it or to withhold it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS].

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I am not surprised to know the attitude of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] upon the amendment which I have offered, for I was entirely aware that he did not regard it as wise. I am surprised, however, to hear my right to offer the amendment challenged. There is but one conclusion that can be drawn from the statements of the Senator from Oregon, and that is that it is impertinent for any Senator to offer an amendment concerning a subject that has been considered by the committee. I am entirely willing that he shall criticize the officers of the National Guard; I am entirely willing that he shall criticize anybody else who may be in favor of this amendment; but I am not willing to hear it suggested that a Senator may not question, without offense to the committee, a bill that has been reported.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Let me interrupt the Senator there. I want to disclaim any such intention as that, Mr. President. If I said anything that led the Senator to infer that, it was the farthest from my intention to question the right of any Senator. What I was referring to was what had transpired outside of the Senate.

Mr. CUMMINS. I am very glad to hear the Senator say that, because I could put no other construction upon his observation than that such amendments as this, which are intended to promote the interests of the National Guard and to make it more secure as a part of the Military Establishment of the United States, should not be seriously considered because they had been presented to the committee and there denied or refused.

This is not a new subject with me. I was in favor of the proposition that is contained in this amendment before I became a Senator, and I am in favor of it still. I am in favor of it because I think it is a valuable change in the direction of preparedness. I am not in favor of what is called the Volunteer Army, but I am not opposed to it because it adds to the preparedness of the United States; I am opposed to it because I think it will destroy in part the preparedness of the country in the event of war. But I shall argue that question when we reach that part of the bill.

I sincerely hope that the Senator from Oregon and the committee will not look upon the amendments that may be offered, especially those that I may offer, as a disparagement of the

work which the committee has done. I understand perfectly the long, weary toil which has been expended in the preparation of this bill, and, as I said the other day, I think it is by far the most complete and the most effective disposition of this very difficult subject that has been proposed to the American people. I am heartily in favor of the bill generally. I am not hostile to the Regular Army, because I look upon it as the great source of defense in our land forces, and I want no one to infer from anything that I have said that I question its place in the establishment of the country.

I have already remarked that whereas there is or has been some difference of opinion with regard to the extent to which we should increase the Regular Army, I intend to stand with the committee in its proposals in that regard. I would support the committee in the proposed organization of what is called the Volunteer Army if I did not thoroughly, profoundly believe that if the plan there suggested is put in operation it will result in the destruction of the National Guard without substituting in its stead any real training force for our young men who now compose the National Guard.

I know, and Senators I think must all feel, that when peace comes, when our minds are no longer distracted with the conflict going on not only in Mexico but across the sea, and Congress comes to consider the wisdom of appropriating annually something like \$30,000,000 or more for the maintenance of the Volunteer Army for purposes of training only, and something like \$40,000,000 or \$50,000,000 for the maintenance of the National Guard, it will not do it, and one or the other of these organizations will be dismissed, and one or the other of them will disappear so far as congressional legislation is concerned.

I am opposed to the volunteer organization simply because I believe that but one organization will be supported by the Congress of the United States, and it is my judgment, and this is a subject upon which I have reflected a great deal, that the most effective body for training, for getting ready to be a soldier, is the National Guard and not the Volunteer Army.

I wanted that to be fully understood in this early part of the discussion because it is so easy to misunderstand one who is insisting upon the interests of the National Guard and its place in the military affairs of the country and to infer that because I am for the National Guard in this respect therefore I do not desire efficient general military discipline and education and training.

So, if war should fall upon us, we would have a great body of men between the ages of 18 and 30 who could be called quickly into the service of the country and could quickly become efficient soldiers. I recognize that the question I have just discussed does not inhere in the amendment which is before the Senate, but it has been brought forward. I have no objection to that, and I wanted my views about it to be known.

Some question has been made with regard to our constitutional power over the National Guard. I am rather sorry that the argument has taken place on either side at this time, although it is not useless, because every word that has been said will become pertinent at some time during the consideration of the bill. In offering this amendment I have taken the bill which has been presented by the committee; I have accepted its view of the relation which should exist between the National Guard and the General Government. I for one do not ask that Congress shall go one step, constitutionally speaking, beyond the bill as it is now before the Senate. I would be, indeed, less than frank if I were not to state that in one particular the bill goes further than I would have gone if I had been composing it myself; in one respect it takes a position which I look upon as somewhat doubtful, and it takes it in behalf of the federalization of the National Guard. This amendment assumes, however, that the report of the committee with regard to the National Guard and the provisions it has embodied in the bill are sound and will be accepted by the Senate. The amendment simply says that if the bill is sound, if the National Guard ought to sustain toward the National Government the relation which is there established, that then at least five officers of the guard should become members of the General Staff.

It is impossible for me to conceive how the federalized National Guard can accomplish all the purposes that this bill seeks to accomplish unless it has representation upon the General Staff. I assume that the President of the United States, to whom is given the power of detail or appointment, will select from among the officers of the National Guard the men most distinguished for their military learning, who have given sufficient study to military science to have mastered it, in so far as it can be mastered. It is unthinkable that the presence of these 5 officers in a General Staff that will be made up of 92 officers could impair the efficiency of the officers of the Regular Army. The very utmost that can be said is that these 5 officers on the

General Staff will add nothing to the learning, the accomplishments, and the skill of the 92 officers of the General Staff. But who dare assert that? Who is willing to say that these 5 officers, selected by the President from all the States of the Union and gathered together with the General Staff, will not be able to add something to the efficiency of that staff?

It occurred to me during the progress of the argument of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] that some one had thought—although I do not think he intended to convey it as his meaning—that the secrets of the General Staff might not be safe if five citizens of the United States, who had been commissioned as officers of the National Guard, who had taken exactly the same oath to support the Constitution, to protect and defend it, and to obey the orders of the President of the United States which the regular officer takes, would disobey or be false or treacherous to their country and impart the secrets of that body to anyone not entitled to know them.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield for a question.

Mr. POMERENE. If the position is sound that no man should be on the General Staff who belongs to the National Guard because he did not have the professional skill of the Regular Army officer and might disclose secrets which the Regular Army officer would not disclose, might not that same argument apply with equal force to the Secretary of War himself, who is usually taken from civil life?

Mr. CUMMINS. Undoubtedly so; but I do not say that the Senator from Oregon made any such suggestion as that. It seemed to me, however, to glimmer through some suggestion that may have been made to him. I know that he would be the first to repudiate any such want of fidelity on the part of the officers of the National Guard. Moreover—

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

Mr. CUMMINS. Just a moment. This amendment provides that no officer of the National Guard who has not been in continuous service for 10 years shall be eligible for the detail. If you will find me an officer of the guard who has been willing to give, without substantial compensation, his service to his country for a period of 10 years in connection with the National Guard, I will show you a man who, in many respects at least, is the equal of any officer of the Regular Army in point of study and general accomplishment. I now yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I want to assure the chairman of the committee that I did not even mean to suggest that he himself entertains that view with respect to the disclosing of secrets by an officer of the National Guard or anything of that sort. I was simply following out what I believed to be the radical consequences which might follow the argument against placing National Guardsmen upon the General Staff.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, if I were in favor of the volunteer section of the bill instead of being opposed to it, and knew that the 260,000 or 270,000 men who may be enlisted under it were to go into the service, I would think it all the more necessary that five officers of the National Guard should be connected with the General Staff, for the volunteer army will be in all essential respects a part of the Regular Army. Their officers are Regular Army officers, and they will be represented on the General Staff by men who command them in a military way.

Now, why should not the National Guard have a representation of the character provided in the amendment? We are all trying to reach the same object; we all want the National Guard to be just as efficient, just as real a strength to the country in time of war as legislation can make it. I hope that those who believe with me that the guard ought to play the part which is assigned to it in this bill will also see the high necessity of giving its officers some relation to the General Staff.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I have no knowledge of or taste for military matters. I might enjoy the pomp and parade of well-drilled troops, with all their fine discipline and display, could I rid my mind of the fact that it means in the final analysis the slaughter of mankind.

Mr. President, I hate the very thought of war. To my mind, it is a step backward in our civilization. It is a reflection upon our boasted advance and our claimed religion. Were I the means, through my act or vote, of bringing on war, whereby homes should be devastated and my fellowman maimed and slaughtered simply for glory, so called, or for the acquisition of territory, I feel that my slumbers would be but a continuous nightmare. I will never vote one dollar for a war waged for territory or any form of aggrandizement under any name. Our

policy in this fair land should ever be a policy simply of defense and protection.

I approach this military measure with much hesitancy. I realize that conditions in the world have much changed in the past few years; that we are confronted by a situation that demands on our part action for the defense of our country. Mr. President, our National Guard has been as our right arm in the past, and I should hesitate to support any legislation that would tend to disintegrate and destroy its splendid service. In New Jersey we have tested it, and well know its value. I am impressed with the thought and I believe that if the pending bill should pass, it would be the death knell of that great arm of our service for protection. I submit that any legislation that should tend to impair or in any way detract from the splendid spirit and ardent patriotism of our National Guard would be a calamity.

The National Guard in New Jersey have acquired armories to the value of over \$3,500,000; in the United States to the value of \$35,000,000. Almost in every instance great sacrifices have been made by the individual members of the companies for the erection and maintenance of these structures. With the destruction of the National Guard they would become but empty barracks. Do the advocates of this measure desire such a result? Deeply impressed with the belief that such will be the result if this bill shall pass unamended, I shall move to strike from the measure section 56. This I shall do in a spirit of patriotism and kindness, thoroughly appreciating the unselfish zeal and thought given this great problem by the committee. I trust, in the interest of my Commonwealth, in the interest of our country, in the interest of the splendid National Guard this land over, that this particular section may be stricken out. Better results will come and the protection and safeguarding afforded our institutions will be more efficient with the National Guard in existence under the present plan than with the National Guard disintegrated and overwhelmed by the overbearing forces of national power.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUGHES in the chair). The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN and Mr. CUMMINS addressed the Chair.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Does the Senator from Iowa desire to address the Senate?

Mr. CUMMINS. I was about to ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I suggest, first, the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Harding	Martine, N. J.	Simmons
Bankhead	Hitchcock	Myers	Smith, S. C.
Beckham	Hollis	Nelson	Snoot
Brady	Hughes	O'Gorman	Sutherland
Brandegge	Husting	Overman	Swanson
Broussard	Johnson, Me.	Fage	Thompson
Burleigh	Jones	Phelan	Townsend
Cañon	Kenyon	Pittman	Underwood
Chamberlain	Lane	Polindexter	Vardaman
Clapp	Lee, Md.	Pomerene	Wadsworth
Clark, Wyo.	Lewis	Ransdell	Warren
Clarke, Ark.	Lippitt	Robinson	Weeks
Cummins	Lodge	Saulsbury	Williams
Curtis	McCumber	Shafroth	Works
du Pont	McLean	Sheppard	
Gore	Martin, Va.	Sherman	

Mr. HUSTING. I desire to announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] is necessarily absent on business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum of the Senate is present.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, up to the present time I have taken no part in this somewhat extended discussion of the amendment now before the Senate. I am only going to say a few words now, in order to make my own position clear, if I can.

I look upon the National Guard as an excellent organization in its place, but I regard it as a State institution and not Federal. The fact that the State is entitled to select the officers and authorized to do so, and to train the National Guard, is evidence to my mind that it was intended by the framers of the Constitution that the State should have absolute control over this force. The State may prevent the calling out of the militia by refusing to appoint officers or refusing to train them and make them efficient soldiers, and I think it is entirely proper

that that should be so. It was not only the intention, but I think it was an entirely proper thing to do.

I think, taking that view, that it would be a mistake to undertake to mingle the Federal branch of the military service and the State branch, and simply for that reason—not because I have any animosities or any objections to the National Guard—I am opposed to this amendment, and shall, for that reason, and that alone, vote against it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS].

Mr. CUMMINS. Or that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BRADY (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. BURLEIGH (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS]. I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE], who is absent from the Chamber, and therefore withhold my vote. If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea."

Mr. HUSTING (when the name of Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota was called). I desire to announce that the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent on important business. I ask to have this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. REED (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] to the Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. SAULSBURY (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COIT]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. SMITH of Maryland (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. LEWIS (when Mr. TILLMAN's name was called). I desire to announce the absence of the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN], who has been suddenly called to his State, and to announce that he has a pair with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF].

Mr. TOWNSEND (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN]. The junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] has a pair with my colleague [Mr. SMITH of Michigan]. In talking with the junior Senator from Missouri we have concluded to transfer our pairs, thus allowing each of us to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. WEEKS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] to the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH] and will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. ASHURST. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. SMITH of Arizona] is unavoidably detained from the Chamber.

Mr. CHILTON. I desire to announce that the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN] is absent on official business. I also desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. GOFF] is absent on account of illness. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] to the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN] and vote "nay."

Mr. SHAFROTH. I desire to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. THOMAS] on account of business of the Senate. He is paired with the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER].

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] to the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] with the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS];

The junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN]; and

The junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] with the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. CHILTON. I wish to announce the absence of the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] on account of official business.

The result was announced—yeas 35, nays 30, as follows:

YEAS—35.

Ashurst	Jones	Pomerene	Sterling
Bankhead	Kenyon	Reed	Sutherland
Clapp	Lane	Robinson	Swanson
Clarke, Ark.	Lee, Md.	Shafroth	Thompson
Cummins	Lewis	Sheppard	Townsend
Curtis	Martin, Va.	Simmons	Underwood
Harding	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Ga.	Vardaman
Hardwick	Myers	Smith, Md.	Wadsworth
Husting	Poindexter	Smith, S. C.	

NAYS—30.

Beckham	Gallinger	Nelson	Sherman
Borah	Gore	O'Gorman	Walsh
Brandegee	Hitchcock	Oliver	Warren
Broussard	Hollis	Overman	Weeks
Cañon	Hughes	Page	Williams
Chamberlain	Lippitt	Phelan	Works
Chilton	Pittman		
du Pont	McLean	Saulsbury	

NOT VOTING—31.

Brady	Fletcher	Lea, Tenn.	Smith, Ariz.
Bryan	Goff	McCumber	Smith, Mich.
Burleigh	Gronna	Newlands	Smoot
Clark, Wyo.	James	Norris	Stone
Cole	Johnson, Me.	Owen	Taggart
Culbertson	Johnson, S. Dak.	Penrose	Thomas
Dillingham	Kern	Ransdell	Tillman
Fall	La Follette	Shields	

So Mr. CUMMINS's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, on Saturday last I addressed the Senate upon what I regarded as the wisdom of striking out section 56 of the bill, but it appears that I did not tender my amendment. I wish to ask if there is any parliamentary rule against my amendment being considered as having been offered at the time? I thought I had tendered it, but it appears that I had not.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I will state to the Senator from Illinois that I think there is another amendment pending for the same purpose which has been submitted by the Senator from New York.

Mr. WARREN. The amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa was to strike out section 56, if that is the one to which the Senator refers.

Mr. LEWIS. Yes. I should like, however, to have my amendment considered as having been tendered at that time. Do I understand that it is consented that my amendment may be considered as having been tendered on Saturday last when I addressed the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. So far as the Chair is concerned, he is perfectly willing to have the amendment considered as pending, since the Senator assures the Chair that he has such an amendment.

Mr. LEWIS. It was my intention to offer it at that time. I presented the matter to the Senate in my argument, but did not tender the amendment formally. I think it was generally understood by Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Where is the amendment?

Mr. GALLINGER. It could not have been accepted at that time, another amendment being under consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to know where the amendment is.

Mr. LEWIS. I have discovered that the amendment had not been tendered to the clerks; it is not in their possession; and I desire now, nunc pro tunc, to supply it.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. There is certainly, however, an amendment pending to strike out section 56; and I rise for the purpose of suggesting to the chairman of the committee and to the Senate that it would be of great help to us in the study of the other provisions of the bill to know at once what we are going to do with section 56. If we should strike out section 56, our votes might be different with reference to other matters in the bill.

Section 56, providing practically for the continental army, involves an appropriation of between twenty and twenty-five million dollars a year. I am, for one, very much opposed to section 56. I hope we will strike it out. I hope we will undertake to develop our forces through the Regular Army and the Regular Army reserve, through the National Guard, and the National Guard reserve. I wish to suggest to the chairman of the committee that if we could take up the motion to strike out section 56 next, and find out what the Senate will do with that motion, it will put us in better shape to know what we wish to do upon other parts of the bill, because many of us would be ready to be more liberal as to the Regular Army if section 56 should be done away with.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President, I simply desire to state that I offered some amendments on Saturday, and they were pending when the Senator from Illinois spoke. The very first one of them was to strike out all of section 56. I should like to add that the Volunteer Army appears also, in line 10 of section 1,

and I believe it appears somewhere else in the bill; I am not quite sure; but, of course, section 56 is the main section providing for a volunteer army.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The Senator's motion is to strike out section 56?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I submitted that motion on Saturday. Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I suggest that the Senator present it formally as an amendment.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. If there is no objection on the part of the chairman, I call up the motion to strike out all of section 56, providing for a volunteer army, and, as I have it in this statement, in time of peace, and in opposition to the Organized Militia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. GALLINGER. Let the amendment be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. The Senator from Maryland proposes to strike out, on page 160, lines 9 to 25, both inclusive, and on page 161, lines 1 to 9, both inclusive, including the proviso at the end of line 2 heretofore agreed to, in the following words:

SEC. 56. The Volunteer Army: The President is hereby authorized, at any time, to organize, maintain, and train, under the provisions of sections 3 to 12, both inclusive, of an act entitled "An act to provide for raising the volunteer forces of the United States in time of actual or threatened war," approved April 25, 1914, volunteer forces, not exceeding an average of 600 officers and enlisted men for each congressional district. The term of enlistment, which shall in no event be greater than that of the Regular Army, the period of service with the colors and with the reserve, and the period of training shall be as the President may prescribe, those passing to the reserve to have the status and obligations prescribed for reserves of the Regular Army. Officers and enlisted men of the volunteer forces raised under the provisions of this section shall be entitled to the pay and allowances of officers and enlisted men of corresponding grades in the Regular Army during periods of training only: *Provided*, That without the consent of Congress such volunteer force shall not be called out for field service for more than a total period exceeding 30 days in any one year.

Temporary appointments and promotions of officers of the Regular Army arising from the operation of this section may be terminated at the discretion of the President.

Officers of the Regular Army who receive commissions in the Volunteer Army herein authorized shall in time of peace receive the pay and allowances of their respective grades in the Regular Army, and no more.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President, I wish to state very briefly why I offer an amendment to strike out this section. The development under this section 56 is left wholly a matter of policy with the department, and there is nothing in the section to provide a definite action. This section, therefore, provides in the first year for a limited number of troops, and for 261,000 if desired and obtainable at the end of four years.

In connection with the suggestion to strike this section out, I have incorporated with other amendments here an amendment to raise the limit that is put by this bill upon the number of the National Guard; and the number suggested will be such that, if the Senate approves, it will make possible a defensive force for this country of 125,000 men more than is provided by this section for the volunteers and the National Guard now in existence.

The real objection to this volunteer section, Mr. President, is that it is a delusion, that it will not give preparedness to this country, and can not give it. If there is anything upon which the experts who testified so extensively before the committees of the House and the Senate did agree, the thing they agreed on was that there can be raised in this country, with extraordinary effort, not more than 50,000 regular soldiers in the course of a year. Of course it may be suggested that as to this volunteer force, who are to be regulars in all respects and purposes so far as compensation is concerned, that the department may provide for them a different status, such as will make the status of volunteers more acceptable, such as will give some incentive to the average man who might enlist, but it is altogether problematical what the department will do and what will be the real result of their action.

This in substance is nothing more than the old Garrison plan of a continental army revived with a little new clothing upon it. I believe the best experts in the War Department have testified as to there being very great doubt as to there being any sufficient enlistments under the Garrison continental army plan. If this volunteer is substantially a regular soldier, according to the compensation of a regular soldier, you can get no more of the volunteers than you can get in the Regular Army to-day.

This is therefore to say the best of it experimental. Yet this proposition is put up in opposition to and for the purpose undoubtedly of beating down the one great force of soldiers who are in sight in this country.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I do.

Mr. WARREN. Do I understand the Senator correctly? Does he claim that this plan is to beat down the National Guard and is intended to be such?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. That is what I intend to suggest, and that I think is the inevitable consequence of the adoption of this volunteer-army plan.

Mr. WARREN. It is going a long way, I think, to impugn those who may think differently. I will say that so far as I know there is not a friend of that measure who is not a friend of the National Guard, and probably as good a friend of the National Guard as is the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I am very glad to hear that, because if that is the case some of them will be more easy of persuasion than I think they are. But however that may be, the availability for purposes of defense of any reasonable number of troops along these lines is certainly very doubtful. If we can take the unvarying testimony of competent officers of the Army, such as Adjt. Gen. McCain, they can enlist only 50,000 men a year for the Regular Army under present conditions, and I doubt if they will get many more under this volunteer proposition.

The real army that is in sight, the actual body of soldiers that are available, are these 144,000 National Guardsmen of this country.

Mr. President, I am going to send to the desk and ask to have incorporated in the RECORD a list of the National Guardsmen of the country, totaling on the last of December, 1915, 134,692 officers and men.

The list referred to is as follows:

Strength of the Organized Militia, commissioned and enlisted, Adjutant General's report, Dec. 31, 1915.

1. Alabama.....	2,968
2. Arizona.....	931
3. Arkansas.....	1,652
4. California.....	3,681
5. Colorado.....	1,059
6. Connecticut.....	3,821
7. Delaware.....	430
8. District of Columbia.....	1,891
9. Florida.....	1,505
10. Georgia.....	3,045
11. Hawaii.....	2,066
12. Idaho.....	931
13. Illinois.....	6,914
14. Indiana.....	2,810
15. Iowa.....	3,507
16. Kansas.....	2,032
17. Kentucky.....	2,583
18. Louisiana.....	1,098
19. Maine.....	1,522
20. Maryland.....	2,346
21. Massachusetts.....	6,633
22. Michigan.....	3,638
23. Minnesota.....	3,224
24. Mississippi.....	1,471
25. Missouri.....	3,493
26. Montana.....	839
27. Nebraska.....	1,525
28. Nevada.....	
29. New Hampshire.....	1,300
30. New Jersey.....	4,428
31. New Mexico.....	872
32. New York.....	17,013
33. North Carolina.....	3,203
34. North Dakota.....	719
35. Ohio.....	7,526
36. Oklahoma.....	1,330
37. Oregon.....	1,559
38. Pennsylvania.....	10,910
39. Rhode Island.....	1,519
40. South Carolina.....	1,411
41. South Dakota.....	925
42. Tennessee.....	1,926
43. Texas.....	2,878
44. Utah.....	544
45. Vermont.....	852
46. Virginia.....	3,279
47. Washington.....	1,308
48. West Virginia.....	1,756
49. Wisconsin.....	3,290
50. Wyoming.....	595
Total.....	134,692

Mr. LEE of Maryland. There is something actual, there is something real, there is something substantial. Yet this bill comes in and proposes to cut that force down by putting in a minimum of 106,000 men. The present law authorizes 153,000 or 154,000 militia National Guardsmen in this country. Why change the law? Why cut down the number of the Organized Militia?

The Senator from Wyoming suggested just now friendliness on the part of the committee to the National Guard, yet they come in with estimates that inflate the cost of the National Guard for the first year \$19,000,000 and with a measure that

cuts down the actual authorized strength of the National Guard of this country from 153,000 to 106,000.

Mr. WARREN. May I ask where the Senator gets those figures?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. The National Guard is limited to 200 to each congressional district and to each Senator. That may not be strictly the provision in this law as proposed by the committee, but I have gone over that section with a competent officer of the Army, and while, in my judgment, it was not absolutely mandatory upon the War Department under the section to limit the numbers of the National Guard to 106,000, yet that officer, reading that section, construed it as the inevitable purpose of Congress, if the section was passed in the words in which the Senate committee reported it, that the National Guard would be cut down to 106,000 officers and men. The department estimates would be based on 106,000—

Mr. WARREN. That may be the idea of the Senator, but I differ with the Senator. It is not my idea.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. The Senator knows there is a limitation there of 200 men. I will be very glad to read that section to the Senator if there is any doubt in his mind.

Mr. WARREN. There is not a line such as that contained in the bill relating to the National Guard, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Unquestionably there is. I do not need to go on with this matter. I think the country wants substantial preparation and I think the country demands substantial preparation. The worst thing we can do is to go ahead with the unwise policy, so to speak, of setting up one kind of soldier against the other. We had better take the Regular Army of the United States and do for it whatever we can do for it and then take the great Army of the Constitution, that Gen. Washington and all the fathers stood for, and do for that what we can do to make it a great, harmonious whole, a well-prepared, thoroughly equipped, and highly disciplined force for the defense of this country. The introduction of this third element here is for nothing but to produce confusion and for no other purpose in the world but to keep up a method of retarding real preparation, that, I regret to say, has been the policy of some officers in the War Department for many years in the past.

But, Mr. President, I believe that there is a larger element of officers in the Regular Army who realize the greatness of this country, realize the marked economy that there is in the citizen soldier, in training him, in supporting him, in keeping him in the industries of the country while he is being trained and while he is being made into a soldier; realize the continental size of this great country and its obligation to the world; and who add to this realization a high sense of loyalty to the Constitution of the United States. There are a great many officers in the Army who would accept with joy and gladness anything that can be done to make the National Guard of this country the proper defensive force it should be and should have been during all of these years past.

Mr. President, it is high time this jealousy of the citizen soldiery of the United States should be brought to a close and that Congress should take firm hold of this question and carry it through to a successful termination.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] the other day said this bill exhausted the powers of Congress on the subject of handling the National Guard and developing the militia. Quite the contrary, Mr. President. I hope to be able to show the Senate a little later that this bill avoids some of the real questions that are involved. The House bill certainly did settle the main questions. The House bill was evidently considered from the standpoint of men who actually wanted to take hold of this question and settle it once for all. But this bill is drawn more upon lines of avoidance of the main questions of law as well as the actual reduction of numbers of men authorized to be in the National Guard of the country from 154,000 to 106,000.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I wish to correct a statement of the Senator from Maryland. I assume he wants to be fair.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I certainly do, Mr. President.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I want to repeat that the bill reported by the committee embodies nearly all the recommendations of the National Guard of the country that the Senator speaks of. Of course we did not give them all they asked, and I do not think Congress is going to give them all they asked, neither did the committee attempt to give the regular forces all they asked, or the several branches of the Army Establishment what they asked. I do not think this Congress will do it either. But the Senator says that the effect of this is not only to reduce the number of the present National Guard but to render it less efficient than it is now.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I beg the Senator's pardon. I made no suggestion or intimation that the reduced number would be less efficient relatively than the present number, so far as discipline is concerned.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. In the very nature of things if you reduce the strength you make them more inefficient.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. With the permission of the Senator, you can reduce the strength of a number of men and at the same time by increasing their discipline make them more efficient. This bill reduces the strength and provides pay, and other methods, ascertaining the fitness of officers for the discipline and development of the National Guard. I think this bill will improve the discipline of the reduced number of National Guardsmen which it seems to leave as a remnant, but what I object to is that you do not take the whole present existing or authorized guard and go on and make it the great citizen army that it can be made and should be made by the Congress of the United States exercising the powers given in the Constitution.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I do not care to go into a discussion as to the efficiency of the guard. I think the history of this country is pretty well understood about that. If anyone has any doubt, I simply ask him to read some of Washington's letters to the Continental Congress, and later to read Gen. Upton's Military Policy of the United States, and ascertain what he says about it. He goes into the subject very fully. But I am not going to discuss that. I want to say that there is no provision in the bill that reduces the National Guard to 106,000. On the contrary, the National Guard is to be increased by increments until it reaches about 265,000 in four years. The bill particularly provides that the present organization shall be maintained; that is, the bill is to perfect the present organization.

Mr. BORAH. May I ask the Senator to state again to what extent the number is increased under the bill?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. There is a possible increase to about 265,000.

Mr. BORAH. The present membership of the National Guard is about 129,000.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. It is about 129,000. Section 62 of the bill provides that—

The number of the National Guard to be organized under this bill within one year shall be for each State in the proportion of 200 for each Senator and Representative in Congress from such State, and a number to be determined by the President for Territories and the District of Columbia, and may be increased each year thereafter in the proportion of 50 per cent until a total peace strength averaging 500 for each Senator and Representative in Congress has been reached—

This is the proviso—

Provided, That this shall not be construed to prevent any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia from organizing the full number of troops required under this section in less time, or from maintaining existing organizations if they conform to such rules and regulations regarding organization, strength, and armament as the President may prescribe.

That protects the present organization if they propose to pay any attention whatever to any rules that may be prescribed for their conduct and control. I do not think the position of the Senator is well taken as to that amendment.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. What effect does the bill have upon the existing National Guard? It does not increase it, but under the bill you limit the number to 106,200. There are already 134,000. Are they to continue under the State laws or will they be brought in under this section of the law?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I was trying to show in my feeble way that the provision of the bill I have just read preserves the present organizations as they are notwithstanding the limitations in the previous part of the section to which I referred. If the contention of the Senator from Maryland is correct then 106,000 would be the number to be raised according to the senatorial and congressional representation, if there were not the further proviso that the present organization shall remain intact. At least that was the intention of the committee in reporting the bill.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Will the Senator from Oregon yield to me for a moment?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Certainly.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. What I alluded to was the requirement in line 9 of section 62, that the number should be in the proportion of 200 for each Senator and Representative in Congress. Of course, if it had been stating the mere proportions you might have said in proportion of 100 to each Senator and each Member of the House, and you would have gotten your proportion just that way and just as well. You said 200, and

the only inference that can be drawn from that 200 is that you propose to start with 200 for each Senator and Member, because it is wholly unnecessary to use the figures 200 to give a proportion.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Of course what the Senator says is true, if it were not for the proviso. The proviso particularly maintains the present organization, notwithstanding the portion of the section to which the Senator refers. It is true, as I stated a while ago, that under the proportion of 200 for each Senator and Representative in Congress the first increment would raise the National Guard to 106,000, practically, as the Senator says; and if the proviso maintains the present organizations as they are, in the course of the second year or the third year or the fourth year the National Guard will be raised to a force of 265,000, in round numbers, exceeding the present organization of 129,000, which remains intact until all the organization is completed under the bill.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I will ask the Senator just one question in conclusion. In view, therefore, of the uncertainty produced upon the minds of the very men who have to administer this law by its language, would it not be better to put in 350,000 as a sufficient proportion? Then you would be sure not to reduce your militia.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I think the judgment of the committee is very different from that of the Senator, and it is just as good as the opinion of some Army officer the Senator has evidently been consulting, or at least he so states. I think the bill is not susceptible of the construction the Senator places on it.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I hope the motion to strike out section 56 will not prevail. This bill is the first attempt made in this country with which I am familiar to build up from a proper foundation an efficient and homogeneous Army. It has been considered for three months. The chairman of the committee and those veterans of the committee who have been associated with military legislation, like the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT], have given it the most intelligent consideration. Consideration has been given to every means which would add anything to the efficiency of the Army. There has been no prejudice whatever against the militia, against any body of Volunteers, or against the Regular Army.

Everyone who knows anything about an Army agrees that the nearer we can come to a regular force serving with the colors the more efficient the Army is going to be, but it is not possible for a nation in time of peace to maintain an army sufficient for its purposes in time of war, and therefore it is necessary to prepare some kind of a supplemental force, a reserve of some kind.

If it were possible to have enough men who had served with the colors and who were then transferred to the reserve to make up such a supplementary force, that would be the most effective way to provide for it, in which case it would be unwise to spend money to maintain a volunteer force or for the National Guard. But that is not possible. We can not get men enough to serve with the colors and then transfer them into the reserve, at least for several years, to properly equip us for our necessities in time of war. Therefore it is necessary to provide an additional force, and the National Guard is the first one to which we naturally turn, because the National Guard is an institution as old as the Government itself. It can not be said, even by the greatest friends of the National Guard, that it has always been an efficient force. It can not be said that it has ever been a thoroughly efficient force, but it is better equipped and drilled to-day, in my judgment, than it has ever been. The Government has in recent years been giving it more intelligent assistance than ever before, and I believe it can be used in the emergency which exists to good advantage.

The War Department came to Congress with a proposition for a continental army of 500,000 men, a proposition which was originally recommended by Maj. Gen. Emory Upton, one of the greatest military experts we have had in the United States. In the intervening years it has met the approval of a great many military men, including that of our General Staff and War College. Yet after giving careful consideration to the arguments in its favor, it did not seem to me it could be adopted and put into effective operation within a reasonable time, and it did seem to me that if an army of anything like 500,000 men were provided in this way it would have a material influence in destroying the National Guard. Therefore I did not think the proposition in that form was practicable.

But we have developed a great deal of military enthusiasm in the past year, and a great many men have become sufficiently interested so that they are willing to give their time and their efforts to assist in building up this supplementary force of

which I have spoken. They are generally men who prefer to perform their service at one time rather than to drill weekly as is done by the National Guard. It is claimed by those who hold themselves as the specially ordained protectors and defenders of the National Guard that if such men want to serve at all they ought to serve in the National Guard.

I have served both in the regular service and in the National Guard a great many years, and I think I am familiar with the reasons why men go into the National Guard and why they go into the regular service. A college man, for instance, may be willing to give a month or even two months of his vacation to military service when it would be exceedingly inconvenient for him to give one or two nights a week to drills, taking time which he should devote to his academic studies. Are we going to say to that young man who can serve in one way but can not in another, "You can not enlist at all unless you serve in a certain prescribed way"? I think such action would be distinctly unwise, and would prevent the Government from getting the benefit of the service of a great number of patriotic young men.

The Military Committee was told by the young men who went to the Plattsburg camp last year and who are going again this year, as well as those who are to go to other camps which are to be established, that they are confident that from thirty to fifty thousand men will be willing to enlist as reserves in the Regular Army, including a willingness to serve whatever time the Government determines is necessary, either one month or six weeks or two months, as the case may be, to qualify themselves to act as reserves until we have enough men who have served with the colors and passed into a reserve to make a suitable military establishment.

If we strike out section 56, we are going to say to these men, "You must either come into the service as National Guardsmen or we do not want you at all." In this emergency why not make provision for both classes, by so doing much more expeditiously and effectively providing for our universally recognized requirements?

I think we are in a position of wanting to get every patriotic man we can into the military service at this time until we have even up to an Army of 500,000 men in all serving under the colors; 500,000 men who can be called on at a moment's notice; 500,000 men who will be sufficiently trained so that they will be efficient when they are called into the service; and it is going to take us a long time to do this unless we adopt every means we can find in order to get men into the service.

Mr. President, I am not saying anything against the National Guard; I want every man who is serving in the guard to be satisfied with that service; but when we look at the report which this committee has made, can it be said that there could be any antagonism to the guard? We are increasing the amount of money which shall be appropriated for its purposes from \$8,000,000 to between \$40,000,000 and \$50,000,000, and I do not hesitate to say that if that amount of money could be devoted to men serving under the colors, serving for one year and then transferring them into the reserve, in my judgment, it would be better expended than it will be.

I do not expect marvels from men serving in the guard. I have served too many years with them to expect anything in the way of a marvel. I know how difficult it is frequently for them to get to their drilling points—to get to their armories—because it conflicts with other engagements. I know how soon the enthusiasm ebbs away after a man has enlisted, and how difficult it is for his officers to get him to drill and to perform necessary military functions. All those prevent a thorough, efficient military force. We must depend on the guard. We ought to federalize it as far as possible. I do not myself know a single thoroughly equipped military officer in it who does not want it to become a part of the National establishment rather than a part of the State establishment.

I am not going to discuss any constitutional question, because I am thankful to say I am not a constitutional lawyer, and I will leave that to the ninety-odd constitutional lawyers in the Senate, but I want to say as a practical proposition the nearer we come to getting away from the 48 armies we have in this country and getting to 1 national army, creating a national spirit in the country and in the men who are serving, the nearer we are going to come to efficiency and good results, and as far as possible we have done that. We have gone perhaps further than we can under strictly constitutional limits. As far as possible we have provided for that in this bill. Let us not throw away the opportunities which we can see by striking out of the bill a proposition which will give us some additional men whom we otherwise would not get.

I do not believe, Mr. President, that it will make any difference in the enlistments in the National Guard. I do not think

any man who will take this camp training would go into the National Guard under ordinary circumstances. Under the new conditions, if the bill is adopted as it is now before the Senate, I expect the guards to be kept at as full strength as in the past, but I think we will get some men whom we could not get under other circumstances, and therefore that it would be weakening our position to strike out section 56 from the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I agree with much that the Senator from Massachusetts has said, and yet I reach very different conclusions from the Senator. I hope we shall strike out section 56. I am opposed to section 56, because I have no faith in the value as soldiers of a body of men who simply go out 30 days each year, principally for a frolic, on a camping expedition.

We have been told over and over again that it takes at least half the time of a private soldier for two years to make a soldier of him. If it takes half the time of a private soldier for two years in a fort, regularly at work, to make a soldier, how are you to make a soldier out of a business or a professional man who goes into camp for 30 days? If the extent of the drill is only 30 days each year, if the length of time that the camp is to last is only 30 days annually, it is to cost us over \$20,000,000. That was the statement and those are the figures in the exhibits to the report of the committee; and the estimate for this camp is, I think, \$21,000,000.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Where does the Senator from Georgia find the provision which limits the training to 30 days a year?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I am not finding any such provision. I said the estimate was that, with a limit of 30 days, we should spend \$20,000,000. If we continued the encampment for 60 days, it would cost \$40,000,000. I am giving an estimate of the expenses in connection with the estimate of the time.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. For how many men would that be?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I think that was for 200,000 men, or perhaps 260,000.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Georgia is doing the military camps which we had last year and those which are to be provided for this year an injustice in the rather flippant, I think, suggestion which he has made, that the men went into camp for a month for a frolic. There is no testimony before the Military Committee that the men did anything other than hard work in those camps. I think, if the Senator will investigate, he will find that as vigorous military service was performed there as is ever performed by men collected for that purpose.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yet I have no doubt that the men go into the camps for a frolic. I do not believe that there can be less pleasure because there is a good deal of work. Idleness never brings pleasure. It will be the frolic and the excitement of the camp, accompanied no doubt with considerable military work. But I have simply no faith in making soldiers out of any such enterprise, and I am backed in my opinion by the evidence we have from those who are our officers, who have told us a number of times that they must have a private two years, working half his time, to make a soldier of him.

I do not believe there is any merit in section 56. I do not believe we shall get any soldiers out of section 56. I would vastly rather spend the money in a more practical and, I think, more useful way.

I have no great confidence in the National Guard as an immediately effective force. I think, however, it is the very best second line of defense that we can establish. It is recognized by our Constitution and it is already organized in the respective States. I have no doubt the National Guard, to become hardened soldiers, would be compelled to work from 90 days to 6 months after they had been called out by the President before they would be really effective for first-line defense; but they are vastly better than the 30-day excursionists; they are really organized; they are really trained; they really, to the extent of the training which they have had, are good soldiers. I am not in favor of yielding to any reckless demands of expenditure on the National Guard. I think this bill is liberal to them so far as expenses go. I would be willing to vote for less.

The real defense of the country—the first line—must be made from the Regular troops and the reservists, and I think we should aim in the Regular troops and the reservists to be prepared to call into action in 30 days a substantial army.

I am not against national defense; I am cordially in favor of preparing for national defense, and it can be done without any great increased outlay of money. If we will make the place of the private in the Regular Army something fit for civil life, if

we will make it a preparation not alone for war but for his work at home after his two years' enlistment with the colors has expired, if we will put half his time during those two years in a substantial, intelligent preparation for the work of the citizen when he goes back to the farm or when he goes back to the store or goes back to the shop, there will not be any trouble about volunteers; there will not be any trouble about getting 100,000 men a year to enter the Regular Army if we want them.

It is the place which the private soldier now occupies that prevents enlistments, and it ought to prevent them. We must greatly change the life and work of the private soldier if we desire to promote enlistment by men as privates in the Regular Army. If we will put an end to the extreme caste that exists; if we will require of the officers a little more decent treatment of the men; if we will put a stop to some of the cruel and barbarous sentences that are put upon the private for trivial offenses; if we will organize a system of devoting one-half the time of the private to preparation for life; if we will introduce into the camp instruction which will give the private soldiers an opportunity to grow mentally and on vocational lines, we can make the Regular Army a place into which boys will be glad to go as privates to develop for the work of civil life.

The Secretary of the Navy two or three years ago directed a system of instruction to private sailors, and he was criticized and ridiculed by certain admirals for doing it; yet while the enlistment in the Navy for the four years prior to his administration never brought the men up to within 8,000 of the allotted number, to-day it is full; to-day there is no difficulty about obtaining regular sailors in number up to the quota allowed by law. During the four years preceding his administration only 3 men were promoted from the ranks to ensign, while during the past three years, under this system of training men in the ranks, 13 have stood the examinations for ensign. With the system introduced of requiring instruction to be given to the men on boats with a view of developing them mentally and of preparing them better for life at home when they have returned home, a substantial improvement has taken place in the character of the men. Thirteen stood examinations for the Naval Academy, and far more numerous promotions have been made from the ranks to paymasters' places and to the clerical force. As I said before, with an 8,000 shortage at the beginning, with this new plan of caring for the men, of treating the men humanely, of regarding their future, the numbers filled up, and there is now no difficulty to get a full quota of men to man the Navy. Yet, Mr. President and Senators, vastly better is the opportunity on land for the development of the private soldier than it is on the water; vastly broader is the opportunity to give them vocational and general instruction.

It is true that we have a little school in some of the forts to which men who desire can go, which is conducted by the chaplains; but it is also true, as I have been assured by a number of chaplains who have sought to do good along these lines, that officers frequently sneer at the men who attend the schools.

I am in favor of putting the stamp of our legislative will, speaking for the people, upon the treatment that is to be given to the private soldier; I am in favor of making the training for civil life by congressional direction a part of the life of the private soldier. Then you will see a change of conduct in the force.

Mr. President, this subject has been one upon which an elaborate report has been made by an officer of the War College. I hold in my hand the report of Col. John Biddle, which is also signed by Brig. Gen. Liggett. The report is upon the advisability of "Instruction of enlisted men in clerical work and in some of the mechanic arts." He says he will take it up in a broad way and that the matter shall "be considered from the standpoint of its effect on the Nation, the Army, and the individual." The report contains the following:

The nation: The security of a nation rests on its military strength, and where, as in our case, this strength, represented by its Regular Army, is so small as not to secure its safety, the Army should be used in time of peace in the creation of a war reserve. We recognize that we need a reserve large enough to raise our Army immediately to war strength and to fill the vacancies caused by the first six months of active operations.

He then takes up the subject of vocational training as it would affect enlisted men, and he reaches the conclusion that if you will introduce educational work for the privates, if you will devote a reasonable portion of the time of the privates to preparing them for civil life, in two years' time you can make them fit soldiers, and yet send them back to their homes wonderfully improved and strengthened for civil life.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I was not in the Chamber when the Senator from Georgia began to read, and I ask from whom he is quoting?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I am quoting from a report of Col. John Biddle, of the General Staff, Chief of the War College Division, made October 27, 1913. He approves thoroughly of the introduction of vocational training as an inducement for enlistment.

The hope in offering this is that a new class of young men may be reached. There can be no doubt that the thoughtful young man will hesitate and think a long time before exchanging three or four years of the formative period of his life for a certain training that, at its end, will find him where he started plus certain qualifications that are not generally recognized in the commercial world as increasing his earning capacity.

On the other hand, if this same service will discharge him with some training of a clerk or an artisan the case will be very different, and he will doubtless be willing to be a member of the reserve for a period in exchange for the training. If we are exhausting the resources of the classes now attracted to the Army, we must reach other classes in the building of a reserve. The requirements should not be made less, so that a lower class of men, now barred, may enter; but a larger high class must be reached. A great obstacle, in the form of the popular idea of what constitutes a soldier, intervenes.

He then goes on to say that if in the Army during the two years of enlistment we provide a school of instruction partly along vocational lines and we offer to the young men and to the grown boys two years' service, part of which is to develop them for life and train them to return to their homes and fill better the position that may be theirs, then we may expect a higher order of enlistments; and he adds that, with a higher order of enlistments, the length of time it will take to train them for soldiers will be much less.

Mr. VARDAMAN. And they will render a higher order of service.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. And a higher order of service will come from the men who enlist.

Unless some better plan than vocational training can be offered to stimulate enlistment—and none has yet been found—such training will soon have an important effect on the welfare of the Nation.

His final conclusion is:

If it be the purpose of the Army to spread military training through the Nation, to create an adequate reserve, to break down the popular prejudice against the Army, to fill our ranks with men who later will be a valuable class of citizens, vocational training is an advisable measure to adopt toward this end.

I ask, Mr. President, that at the close of my remarks the entire report of Col. Biddle be printed in the RECORD.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Now, what does this mean? Our reservists after two years' service with the colors are to receive only \$24 a year. I believe that the way to build up our national defense in the first line is from the Regular Army and through the regular reservists. The hesitation on the part of some officers about pressing reliance upon the Regular Army and the reserve from the Regular Army has been the fear of enlistments, and some have actually talked about conscription. Ah, Mr. President, it is a reflection on the treatment of the privates when any thought of conscription is suggested. Give them what they are entitled to, give them what we can give them, and they will beg for the opportunity to enlist, instead of resisting it. Under the two-year system—because under this bill any private at the end of two years may retire to the reserve—we will in a short time transfer to the reserve a splendid body of young men who have had two years' thorough training and are thorough soldiers. They will go back to their homes with their buttons as members of the reserve army of their country. They will be an inspiration because of the knowledge they will be able to furnish to their fellows as to the treatment they have received and as to the instruction they have received as private soldiers.

We ought to build in a few years a reserve of 400,000 men not only fit for soldiers but prepared for citizenship, to do their part at home.

This can be done with nominal additional expense if we will require half the time of privates with the colors devoted to study and instruction, coupled with vocational training.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I will suggest, in this connection, that anything that equips the citizen to meet the duties of life, that enables him to contribute something to the well-being of his Government and makes him a useful factor, is one of the largest contributions to this thing we call "preparedness." Instead of being a mere machine, he becomes a factor in the Government, and, instead of being a consumer, which the Regular Army soldier is, he contributes something to the total wealth of the country. It is an investment when you equip him in the Army for the duties of life.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. And, Mr. President, that will be equally true when we say to our graduates of West Point, "We are not preparing you simply to be soldiers; you are to be citizens also; you are to carry in your forts and in your barracks part of the responsibility of training men for civil life; you are

to train the boys; we trust to you; you are to help build up the boys who are permitted by their parents to leave their homes and to enter as privates in the Regular Army. We trust you, officers, to take these young men and, by example and by instruction, build them into a substantial part of our national citizenship." By such a course you will make the officers grow; they will be better men and bigger men; they will be bigger officers when they carry part of the responsibility of preparing the boys of the country to be better citizens; and the horror we have of militarism will be gone, for the officer, while prepared to defend his Nation in case of war, will be contributing all the time to strengthen his Nation by adding to the power of these young men in times of peace.

Mr. President, I am opposed to section 56. I am opposed to that section because I do not believe we will get any real effective Army out of it. I believe that we should eliminate that paragraph, and we should turn our attention to the reserves that we are to obtain from the Regular Army, and we should so frame the measure that in a few years we may have as many as 500,000 men, partly with the colors and partly in reserve, who, in 30 days, could be called to the colors, ready for immediate and efficient service.

With such a body of men prepared to meet an enemy at our coast, no nation in the world would undertake to land troops upon our shores. I am not seriously afraid of that contingency, anyhow. I do not believe we are in great danger of war; but if we can build up in the line of preparedness a reserve to preserve peace, if we can insure preparedness against a possible enemy, and at the same time add to the power of our young men in civil life, if we can strip the system of waste and make it a dynamic force for civil life, the objection to it is gone. I think the money proposed to be spent upon the 30-day excursions would be vastly more useful if spent in employing teachers, in addition to the officers of the Army, to train the boys who enter the Regular Army. I am not opposed to preparedness, but, because I wish real preparedness, I am opposed to section 56.

APPENDIX.

[Memorandum for the Chief of Staff.]

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF STAFF,
Washington, October 27, 1913.

Subject: Instruction of enlisted men in clerical work and in some of the mechanic arts.

Herewith is a memorandum from the Chief of Staff, dated September 17, 1913, calling for an opinion as to the advisability and practicability of establishing certain classes of instruction for enlisted men in clerical work and in some of the mechanic arts. In considering this subject, the Secretary of War desires that the matter be gone into carefully, and that the report submitted be not limited to the subjects indicated but that it be as full as practicable.

I. PREVIOUS CONSIDERATION OF THIS SUBJECT.

1. This matter has been considered on two previous occasions. Some two years ago Chaplain John A. Randolph, United States Army, submitted a plan with a view to instructing enlisted men by means of the several correspondence schools operating in this country. In War College memorandum, September 7, 1911 (6031-4), the plan was adversely reported, it being deemed impracticable by reason of the expense involved.

2. Consideration was next given to a plan, proposed by Mr. Wilson L. Gill, in which civic and industrial training was to be made a leading feature of Army instruction, but which required the use of so much time as to interfere with military training. This also was adversely reported upon and the plan was not put into effect, the decision being based solely on military expediency (WCD. 6845-3, Nov. 3, 1911).

II. ADVISABILITY.

3. In considering the advisability of introducing this system the War College argument against it is as potent to-day as it was two years ago, but the changes that have occurred since then, the development of our military policy, and the awakened interest of the public in the Army, all indicate that the matter may need reconsideration.

To take as broad a view as possible, this matter should be considered from the standpoint of its effect on the (a) Nation; (b) the Army, and (c) the individual.

4. (a) The Nation: The security of a nation rests on its military strength, and where, as in our case, this strength, represented by its Regular Army, is so small as not to secure its safety, the Army should be used in time of peace in the creation of a war reserve. We recognize that we need a reserve large enough to raise our Army immediately to war strength and to fill the vacancies caused by the first six months' of active operations.

In this connection it may be accepted that a maximum army of 100,000 men, in time of peace, is all that the Nation will allow. To create an adequate force in time of peace a system must be adopted by which a large number of men may be enlisted to serve with the colors only long enough to train them into soldiers, and then pass into the reserve, and their places to be filled by new men. As it is now it is only with considerable difficulty that an army of some 80,000 can be kept recruited; how, then, can the voluntary enlistment of a vastly greater number be secured? Obviously by offering inducements greater than now offered and large enough to accomplish the object sought. Increased pay allowances have been suggested as such inducements, but this may be dismissed, as the classes of men that can be reached by pay are now being enlisted, except those who may be induced by pay so great as to be prohibitive. Shortening the term of service has also

been suggested, but the length of term of service must be based on the time required to make a soldier, and moreover must be determined mathematically by the size of the Army and the required reserve.

5. A third suggestion is that of offering vocational training as an inducement for enlistment. The hope in offering this is that a new class of young men may be reached. There can be no doubt that the thoughtful young man will hesitate and think a long time before exchanging three or four years of the formative period of his life for a certain training that, at its end, will find him where he started plus certain qualifications that are not generally recognized in the commercial world as increasing his earning capacity. On the other hand, if this same service will discharge him with some training of a clerk or an artisan, the case will be very different, and he will doubtless be willing to be a member of the reserve for a period in exchange for the training.

6. If we are exhausting the resources of the classes now attracted to the Army, we must reach other classes in the building of a reserve. The requirements should not be made less, so that a lower class of men, now barred, may enter, but a larger high class must be reached. A great obstacle in the form of the popular idea of what constitutes a soldier intervenes.

According to popular belief, give a man a rifle and a uniform, teach him enough to march in a parade, and you have a soldier, and in a collection of such an army. There is nothing that the public can then see for the rest of the soldier's enlistment, but idleness and its attendant evils, and self-respecting parents oppose the entrance of their sons in such a life. The prejudice of the better class of people must be overcome, and when they are convinced that the Army is spending what they now believe to be idle time in industrial training, we may expect such magazine articles as "The Army—an idle man's job," to disappear.

7. Unless some better plan than vocational training can be offered to stimulate enlistment, and none has yet been found, such training will soon have an important bearing on the welfare of the Nation.

8. (b) The Army: When those who have been engaged in the training of enlisted men for some years are brought in contact with the results accomplished at educational institutions where officers of the Army are on duty, they can hardly, at first, believe it has been possible to accomplish in weeks what the enlisted man requires months to master. It is soon apparent that the superior intelligence of the student, combined with his purpose to do, places him in a class apart. It is believed that the inducement of vocational training will bring to the Army a class of intelligence that will not only permit of soldiers being made in less time, but will make a better, more contented, and more valuable Army. This, then, would indicate that a shorter term of enlistment is necessary before this class may pass to the reserve.

9. The individual: The offering of this training is rather to the enlisted man whom it is expected will be obtained under the new policies than to the majority of the present enlisted force. The Army now consists largely of two great classes—the professional soldier, whose business it is to be a soldier and who consequently is not seeking other training, and the man whose purpose in life was not formed before he enlisted and who for the present is contented with what he has. The latter man, if they be young, as is generally the case, have never been provided, have never tried any occupation seriously, and will be extremely difficult to interest in any; and, if they be older—that is, past 30—they have failed to establish themselves in anything, and are past the age when they may be trained along a particular line. There are also a few—it may be said a very few—men in the Army whose enlistments were prompted by other motives, such as patriotism, or a desire for travel, and in almost every company to-day there are from one to three men who are following a correspondence school course. All these latter classes, together with the men of the other classes whose interest can be aroused, would welcome an opportunity for clerical or manual training.

Certainly the introduction of this training will place a different aspect on Army service from the viewpoint of those who will accept the training. They will have an occupation for their leisure time, they will be made more content, and will be given a purpose in life.

10. Conclusion: If it be the purpose of the Army to spread military training through the Nation, to create an adequate reserve, to break down the popular prejudice against the Army, to fill our ranks with men who later will be a valuable class of citizens, vocational training is an advisable measure to adopt toward this end.

III. PRACTICABILITY.

11. In considering this subject it will be well first to examine what is now being done along this line in the Army. There is conducted at every post a school for enlisted men where the ordinary school subjects are taught. Attendance on the part of the enlisted men is voluntary, but when once accepted the course becomes a military duty for that school year. The attendance is usually very small, the school not being favorably regarded. The chaplain, where there is one, is in charge of the school, and where successful it is due to his personal fitness for the work and his standing with the men. The schools for cooks and bakers are open to all enlisted men, and in a course of some four months make of an intelligent man who tries a competent cook or baker. It is frequently difficult to find men to volunteer for this instruction. The other schools pertain to particular branches of the service, in which instruction is given as follows:

12. Hospital Corps: Trains in nursing, sanitation, and pharmacy, and has afforded opportunities for X-ray and laboratory work, which have been embraced by some enlisted men to their subsequent advantage in civil life.

13. Signal Corps: Trains in several branches of electricity, in telegraphy, telephony, and aviation. Maintains one Signal Corps school. Discharged soldiers of this corps are now filling many positions in civil life by reason of this training.

14. Engineer Corps: During the season of indoor instruction "trade schools" are maintained at all posts and subjects such as surveying, drafting, photography, carpentry, pipe fitting, cement and masonry work, and lithography are taught. Such progress is made that upon discharge the average man has a vocation.

15. Mounted service: Schools for saddlers, blacksmiths and farriers, and a school of equitation have, together with the daily work, produced a great many trained men.

16. Coast Artillery Corps: The training of the indoor season is largely along lines which will fit a man for a civil occupation. Posts have power plants, and much of the training is in their operation and in the development of engineers (steam, oil, and gas), firemen, mechanics, and electricians. Selected men are sent to the school for enlisted specialists, where the training in certain of the mechanic arts is quite complete.

17. Infantry: Training, except as cooks and bakers, is only in military matters. Enlisted men, from time to time, at the post shops pick up more or less of a trade by assisting those regularly employed.

18. The foregoing shows that in those corps—Medical, Signal, Engineer, and Coast Artillery—where the work pertains to certain of technical lines of civil life, the enlisted man is receiving vocational training, while in the mobile branches, where the work is essentially military, he generally is not receiving such training.

19. The pursuits of civil life qualify men to fill many of the positions in the technical corps of the Army in event of war, but not so in the mobile Army. It is here that the reserve is principally needed, that the greatest inducements to promote enlistment must be made, and that the proposed inducement of vocational training now exists the least.

20. To what extent can vocational training be introduced in the mobile Army without sacrificing the first essential of military training and efficiency?

21. The year for the mobile Army is divided into two periods of training—field and garrison. During the field-training period there is little time available, and on some days none, as during the target practice. During the garrison-training period the garrison-school course of five months, beginning November 1, is held, and most of the period is of necessity given to indoor work largely theoretical. The time that can be given to this kind of instruction is limited by the time the man's attention can be held, his intelligence, and the extent to which it is desirable that a subject be carried. This season is characterized by confinement to barracks and consequent idleness on the part of the enlisted man, but the officer, with his administrative work, boards, courts-martial, noncommissioned officers and garrison schools, and post-graduate work, with all the study, reading, and research these call for, finds this his busiest time, in which he can hope to do but little more. During this period the average enlisted man, not a noncommissioned officer, could give one hour in the morning and three in the afternoon to civil training. When the tactical instruction is properly conducted, it can and should be completed ordinarily by noon, which leaves little but certain routine work, such as stables, for the afternoon. To prevent idleness or to improve the looks of the reservation, it has been a practice on the part of some post commanders to impose excessive fatigue and to have much time spent in nonmilitary labor of no practical value.

22. Many a post commander who has been complimented for the appearance of his post should have been censured for imposing upon his command hours of needless drudgery that lowered the military value of his command and caused discontent and desertion. Time that has so often been put to such purpose as this will give a good many hours of vocational training, with excellent results.

23. It must be concluded that we can give some time in summer and more in winter without encroaching on the time usually given to military training, and if vocational training does take some of the military time, we can in the six months of outdoor work do more intensive training.

If the European soldier can be made in 14 months, as it is agreed, we can certainly in two or three years, in each of which six consecutive months entirely and a small part of each day of the other six are available, accomplish the same and more with the American.

24. Conclusion: The practicability of introducing this training is apparent, but such practicability should not be destroyed by the application of an impracticable system. The whole question will be solved successfully or otherwise by the methods employed.

IV. ADOPTION OF A SYSTEM OF VOCATIONAL TRAINING.

25. If it be decided to introduce this as a feature of Army training, care must be taken not to so introduce it as to have it meet with opposition in the Army. The training of an Army officer makes him cautious. His profession teaches him to adhere to tried principles and to view innovations with distrust. The officer of long service has seen too many changes, too many schemes introduced that amounted to naught and those that have survived; he has seen come in one at a time, with a rush, until the service was dominated by this one thing; then he has seen it collapse and recover or begin a retrograde movement until a successful equilibrium was finally attained. If this plan be put in effect simply by a peremptory order, it may be taken for granted that there is going to be some opposition and lack of cooperation, for every officer believes it is his duty to make the best possible soldier of the enlisted man and to oppose any plan he thinks might prevent the most complete attainment of this purpose. On the other hand, if the officer learns that this is not a visionary scheme thrust upon him which after a time will be allowed to drop into oblivion, but is a vital issue; if he is made to understand the greater purpose, why this is being done and what it is hoped to accomplish thereby, his loyal cooperation is a certainty and the success of the plan assured.

26. The past furnishes some examples, and the study of some scheme carried to a successful conclusion will afford some precedents that may prevent a false start now being made. Consider military education, for instance, a subject closely allied to the one being studied. The excellence and great value of our garrison and service schools were not speedily attained. Orders were issued, but the idea, while received with enthusiasm by the younger officers, was generally opposed.

27. For years the schools, although the subject of some elaborate orders and reports, produced no practical results. There was no General Staff, no one in particular to push this work forward and to be responsible for its development. It required nearly the growth of a new generation to make this a vital matter. Had there then been a committee of the General Staff, as there now is, directly charged with the coordination, fostering, and developing of this matter, years of failure might have been avoided.

28. All of the foregoing, then, suggests a plan of procedure as follows:

The 1st of November, the opening of the school training period, is the natural date for beginning the system, which for the first year may be tentative and put in effect at a few selected posts. The posts selected should be garrisoned by each arm of the mobile Army, be widely separated in climatic conditions and surroundings, large enough in size to afford enough volunteers for the purpose, garrisoned by organizations not apt to be moved during the time of the trial, and preferably be in different departments. Posts that meet these requirements are suggested as, in the Eastern Department, Fort McPherson, Ga., a post well equipped with post shops, and where this plan has already received favorable comment, and at Fort Ethan Allen, Vt.; in the Central Department, Fort Riley, Kans., garrisoned by Field Artillery, and about the only post now available in that department, and, moreover, the site of two schools for enlisted men; in the Southern Department garrisons are now too much occupied by the border patrol to be considered; and in the Western Department, Vancouver Barracks, Wash.

29. The posts having been decided upon, the next step will be for an officer who thoroughly understands the purpose, who believes in it and its successful culmination, to visit the selected posts in turn. Here a conference will be held with the officers, explanations made, and their cooperation secured. With the enlisted men who then volunteer a school will be established to fit that particular locality and to utilize local facilities.

30. The three or four schools, once established, will by the end of six months furnish information and experience on which to base future plans. It should then become the duty of the committee of the General Staff charged with educational matters to take charge of this as an educational matter and prepare the general plan to go into operation on the following November 1.

31. There will then be a nucleus of experienced officers whose services will be available in starting the training. In the meantime the General Staff committee mentioned will have time to make a detailed study, with a view to profiting thereby, of the experiences of several countries that since 1906 have done more or less along these lines.

V. COURSE OF INSTRUCTION.

32. It is advisable to begin with the means at hand and to avoid expenditures wherever possible and not to seek congressional aid. The following course is suggested as of practical operation at the posts considered, and involves slight expenditure. Textbooks, as heretofore, will be supplied by the Quartermaster Corps, as well as stationery and other simple supplies.

33. The plan proposed with which tentatively to start the work is as follows:

1. Course in electrical work:
 1. Stenography
 2. Typewriting
 3. Bookkeeping and penmanship
2. Course in telegraphy and telephony:
 1. Operation of the central energy system
 2. Operation of the local battery system
 3. Overhead and underground linemen.
 4. Telegraphy.
3. Course as clerk in grocery business:
 1. Handling of wholesale groceries.
 2. Weighing and sale of retail groceries.
 3. Meat cutting.
4. Course in hospital work:
 1. Nursing.
 2. Pharmacy.
5. Course as janitor:
 1. Care and cleaning of buildings, windows, floors, etc.
 2. Care of plumbing and electric lighting systems.
 3. Operation of steam and hot-water heating plants.
6. Course as stationary engineer:
 1. Operation of stationary engines and pumps.
 2. Fireman.
7. Stable course:
 1. Stableman: Grooming, feeding, and care of horses; care of stable; care of harness.
 2. Driver: Same as above; harnessing, driving.
 3. Delivery man: Same as 2; care of delivery wagons.
8. Course in cooking.
9. Course in baking.
10. Course in mechanic arts:
 1. Carpentry and building.
 2. Blacksmithing and horseshoeing.
 3. Saddlery and harness making.
 4. Painting.
 5. Masonry, plastering, cement work.
 6. Printing, typesetting.
11. Course as barber.
12. Course in surveying and mechanical drawing:
 1. Use of transit, level, stadia, and plane table.
 2. Drawing, blue-print reproduction.
13. Garrison school course:
 1. Common-school branches.
 2. Advanced work.
 3. Languages.
14. Special courses.

DISCUSSION OF COURSES.

Course 1: The teaching of stenography might require a civilian instructor. If so, the hire of a clerk could be authorized, who would be required to teach in the afternoon and evening. The other courses under this heading will require no expenditures.

Course 2: To be under the signal officer, who, with the Signal Corps men at the post and the means at hand, can conduct the course. The number of telegraph instruments at the post might have to be increased.

Course 3: To be given at the commissary. There is generally one man on duty as butcher. If no enlisted man, who is an expert meat cutter, is available, the hire of a competent civilian to perform this duty and teach the enlisted men should be authorized. The sale of meat is now part of almost every retail grocery, and a man capable of working in each department is much sought.

Course 4: To be under the surgeon. The demand for competent male nurses always exists. Men could be prepared for examination for registered pharmacist.

Course 5: Needs no discussion.

Course 6: Can be carried on in the post pumping plant.

Course 7: The post stables and the services of civilian employees and veterinarians to be utilized.

Courses 8, 9: Best conducted at the regular schools. Men so desiring, be allowed to attend.

Course 10: The post shops; civilian and enlisted employees to be utilized.

Course 11: There is much demand for this instruction, and many barbers in every command. There will be difficulty in establishing this instruction, which must be solved according to the local circumstances surrounding the question.

Course 12: Any graduate of the Military Academy can conduct this instruction.

Course 13: To be extended, made liberal, and attendance encouraged. Night classes to be held, without exception, in addition to those in the daytime.

Course 14: By this it is intended to cover special cases. For instance, should an electric line run into the post, it will probably be possible to arrange for the training of conductors, motormen, etc.; also, the company that lights the post would probably assist in the instruction

of men in the various duties of their employees. Nothing definite can be laid down in this matter, but officers interested can accomplish much.

Lectures: By officers, on subjects of general interest, should be given frequently. Local educators, ministers, professional men, and mechanics would probably respond to an invitation to address the garrison or the special classes.

Agriculture: The Army does now, and always will, draw largely from the rural districts. The average young man from the country who enlists, giving his occupation as a farmer, can plow, sow, and perform the other work incident to the farm, but of scientific agriculture, horticulture, dairying, breeding, poultry raising, and similar subjects he knows but little. The establishment of these courses is most desirable and most difficult of all, as there are no instructors available, generally speaking. Land and many farming implements are available. There is in every State a Government-supported agricultural college. Most of these maintain a six-months' winter course, to be held when outdoor work on the farm is suspended. These institutions are those where Army officers conduct, by law, a course in military science and tactics. A reasonable number of enlisted men could be sent to these institutions for the short course. Doubtless free tuition could be arranged in return for their services as assistants to the Army officer on duty there. Their pay and a 50-cent per day commutation of rations would doubtless meet all their expenses. As the short-course students take the military course, the presence of a few enlisted men would be the greatest aid in the training of this class.

Possibly the Department of Agriculture could and would lend aid in establishing this course. The bulletins and literature of this department, at least, are available.

EXPENSE TO THE ENLISTED MAN.

At first nothing. A study to be made of the experiences of foreign services, where a charge has been made, under the supposition that, if paid for, more attention will be given by the student than he would give to free instruction.

VI. PRACTICABILITY OF INTRODUCING VOCATIONAL TRAINING IF THE ENLISTMENT PERIOD BE REDUCED.

34. The reduction of the enlistment period from the present four years to two years or so, as the policy of the War Department, will not, it is thought, affect the above conclusion.

While, of course, the training during that short time is presumed to be intensive, in order to secure the highest results within that time, nevertheless, it is believed that there will be many hours, especially during the winter, when the soldier can not be engaged in actual military training, and during that time it would seem proper that he should be offered opportunities to improve himself in other ways. The vocational training suggested is not intended in any way to take the place of military training. If there is no time for the purpose, then the men would not be able to have this vocational instruction.

It is not the intention to establish schools which will take up time of the enlisted man to the detriment of his military training, but simply to give him occupation for his spare time, making him better suited to follow a civil pursuit on discharge, and thus to attract to the service a larger class of men who look beyond their time of enlistment. This is especially true in the short-time service with reenlistment not permitted, where a good man must consider his future after discharge.

VII. RECOMMENDATION.

1. That the instruction of enlisted men in clerical work and in some of the mechanic arts be adopted tentatively as a part of Army training.
2. That the plan outlined herein be put into operation.

JOHN BIDDLE,

Colonel, General Staff, Chief of War College Division.

H. LIGGETT,

Brigadier General, United States Army.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I desire to refer to one or two statements of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] as to section 56. The Senator refers to the annual encampments as being in the nature of picnics, and intimates that the training the men get in such encampments is wholly insufficient to fit them for the Army. Mr. President, the Senator has evidently not used a pencil in his calculations, but I ask him to take a pencil and use it just a little bit in reference to the National Guard, and to compare the results obtained with the results that he would obtain by making an estimate as to the 30-day "picnics" of which he speaks. Under the practice usually followed now by the National Guard of the country they usually meet once a week; there may be exceptions to the rule, but I think pretty generally they meet once a week and drill in their armories from one and a half to two hours. With 52 weeks in a year and placing the number of drill hours at the outside limit of 3 in each week there is a maximum of about 156 hours of drill a year.

If you will add to that the time spent at the annual encampments, where they engage in maneuvers, sometimes in connection with the Regular Army, you will have 24 days longer of training. Twenty-four days, say, at 8 hours a day, will make about 192 hours more that they would drill in a year. That, added to the drills in the armories, will not make over 348 hours of drills in a year. Now, take this bill, which specifies how much time shall be spent by the National Guard in drilling, and we find the following provision:

SEC. 91. Training of the National Guard: Each company, troop, battery, and detachment in the National Guard shall assemble for drill and instruction, including indoor target practice, not less than 48 times each year, and shall, in addition thereto, participate in encampments, maneuvers, or other exercises, including outdoor target practice, at least 24 days each year, 5 of which shall be in rifle practice, unless such company, troop, battery, or detachment shall have been excused from participation in any part thereof by the Secretary of War.

And further:

Provided, That such enlisted man shall receive the compensation herein provided if he shall have attended not less than 48 regular drills

of not less than 1½ hours each during any one year, and a proportionate amount for attendance upon a lesser number of such drills, not less than 24: *Provided further*, That the compensation provided herein shall be computed for semiannual periods, beginning the 1st day of January and the 1st day of July of each year, in proportion to the number of drills attended; and no compensation shall be paid to any enlisted man for the first semiannual period of any year unless he shall have attended during said period at least 24 drills, but any lesser number of drills attended during said period shall be reckoned with the drills attended during the second semiannual period in computing the compensation, if any, due him for that year: *And provided further*, That when any man enters into an enlistment he shall be entitled to proportional compensation for that year if during the remainder of the year he shall attend a number of drills whose ratio to 24 is not less than the ratio of the part of the year so served to the whole year; and when any man's enlistment shall expire the compensation, if any, to which he may be entitled shall be determined in like manner: *And provided further*, That periods of any actual military duty equivalent to the drills herein prescribed, except those periods of service for which under existing laws members of the National Guard may become entitled to the same pay as officers and enlisted men of the corresponding grades in the Regular Army, may be accepted as service in lieu of such drills when approved by the Secretary of War.

Forty-eight times, with one hour and a half spent at each drill, amounts to 72 hours of drill that they will have to engage in. Add to that the 24 days, if you please, when they are out in the field, and put it at the highest limit—8 hours a day—and you have 192 hours more, which added to the 72 hours, makes 264 hours, for which we will pay a large sum of money, as disclosed by the estimates.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. How much?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Look at the estimate here—over \$40,000,000.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Is it proposed that we pay that much?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. It is proposed that we pay that much to the National Guard.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. If the Senator will allow me, I am not urging that we pay them that amount. I myself said that I did not know that I would vote for that increase of pay to them.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I want to find out what the Senator does want.

The Senator charges that these volunteers go out on a picnic once a year. If they go out on a picnic once a year, the National Guard go out on a picnic once a year, because they indulge in exactly the same maneuvers and the same kind of practice and under the same kind of officers and for a less time. So that the National Guard under this bill—and I am not criticizing them, but I think Senators ought to be fair when they come to talk about this bill—the National Guardsmen under this bill, for which they are getting paid, drill 264 hours in a year. Under the same bill, the men at these encampments that the Senator says are simply engaged in summer picnics go out and drill 30 days—8 hours a day—and putting it at the same limit that was given the National Guard, they drill 240 hours; and it is consecutive training—30 days of absolutely consecutive training. So that there is only 24 hours difference in a year between the volunteers provided here and the National Guard, the members of which are getting paid for their services. That is a fair statement of it, Mr. President.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Then, Mr. President, let us cut the others down half.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am not proposing—the Senator is—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair might as well settle this question now. The rules require that after two speeches have been made by a Senator on any one day on the same subject, there must be consent of the Senate to make any further one.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am perfectly willing to comply with the rule. The motion now is really to strike out section 56, although the Senator has discussed another feature of the bill, which I assume will come up a little later. I am not going to address myself to that now. I am talking about the striking out of section 56, which provides for the Volunteer Army. You see, then, the unfairness of the Senator's criticism in talking about the volunteer system as a "picnic," when they drill 240 hours a year, and the National Guard, which pretends to drill for a whole year, indulges in drilling for 254 hours. That is just the difference between the two systems.

As to the efficiency of the volunteer system, I want to ask the Secretary to read a letter received by me from the Secretary of War under date of March 28, inclosing to me a letter written to him by the Secretary of the Governing Committee of the Military Training Camps Association of the United States, which was referred to by the Senator from Massachusetts.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none.

The SECRETARY read as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, March 23, 1916.

HON. GEORGE E. CHAMBERLAIN,
Chairman Committee on Military Affairs,
United States Senate.

DEAR SIR: I am inclosing herewith a copy of a letter addressed to me from the secretary of the Governing Committee, Military Training Camps Association of the United States. As this letter gives a brief review of the results obtained from the training-camp movement and the importance of the legislation now pending in reference thereto, it occurred to me that it would be of value to your committee.

Sincerely, yours,

NEWTON D. BAKER,
Secretary of War.

MILITARY TRAINING CAMPS ASSOCIATION
OF THE UNITED STATES,
31 Nassau Street, New York City, March 13, 1916.

To the Hon. NEWTON D. BAKER,
Secretary of War, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I want to thank you most sincerely for the letter you gave us on March 16, indorsing the work of the Military Training Camps Association. We are sending a copy to all of the 4,200 men who have attended Regular Army camps of instruction, and I can assure you that your words of encouragement will mean a great deal to the many civilians throughout the country who, at considerable personal sacrifice, are working to promote the training-camp idea.

There is one phase of the movement I did not touch upon at our conference the other day to which I would respectfully invite your attention. Heretofore, owing to the absence of legislation, these camps have had no definite legal status and no appropriation to support them. Consequently we have, unfortunately and much against our will, been compelled to limit our recruiting to men who could afford to pay their own way, which, including uniform, rations, transportation, etc., averages nearly \$60 per man. It is obvious that these camps can never be thoroughly democratized unless they are thrown open to every able-bodied citizen of the United States who desires to take the training. No movement of this character could be either permanent or of real benefit to the Nation unless it is placed upon this democratic basis.

It has been and will be the policy of this association to refrain from any attempt to influence legislation and to confine its activities solely to recruiting. To that end we consulted with Mr. Garrison last autumn and were advised that he would do his best to see that legislative provision be made for the training camps. On his resignation we were thrown back upon our own resources and felt it necessary to send a delegation to appear before the House Committee on Military Affairs on the last day of their hearings. The committee has made provision for the camps in section 83 of the bill H. R. 12766, recently reported by Mr. HAY and now before the House.

The hearings of the Senate committee had closed, but we addressed a letter to the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, in which we asked for the legislation embodied in section 83 of the House bill, not being then aware that the Senate committee proposed to provide for a force of Federal volunteers. It now appears that the training camps can readily be merged with the Federal volunteer system provided for by section 58 of the Senate bill and can be carried on to greater advantage under that bill than under the House bill, section 83.

A comparison of the two sections will indicate that, while section 83 of the House bill furnishes legal authority for the future conduct of the camps, it contemplates an appropriation covering only a small portion of the individual's expenses, namely, his rations, while section 58 of the Senate bill embraces a far more comprehensive scheme looking to the establishment of a real Federal volunteer force. Under the provisions of section 58, which entirely eliminates the matter of expense to the individual, a really democratic citizens' force can be established.

The section very wisely leaves the question of enlistment to the discretion of the President, and we can not too emphatically urge that this be done, for in building upon the volunteer sentiment it is essential that the Secretary of War have wide latitude in devising forms of enlistment to men of various ages and groups (such as married and unmarried), so as to tap all sections of the population of military age. A drastic and inflexible enlistment provision at the outset might seriously endanger the whole movement for raising citizen reserves under the volunteer system, whereas a liberal and flexible policy in this regard is capable of far-reaching results.

For the reasons stated it is our hope that when the two bills go to conference section 83 of the House bill will give way to section 58 of the Senate bill, and that the latter will become law. But the absolutely essential point for us is that the training camps shall obtain some reasonable legislative recognition and appropriation.

We can assure you of the existence of a strong Federal volunteer sentiment that is abroad in the country, a sentiment that has sought and will continue to seek expression through the training-camp movement. We conservatively estimate, on the basis of reports from our committees and offices throughout the country, that 30,000 men will attend the camps this summer. This enrollment is being made on the basis of each man paying \$50 to \$60 for expenses and transportation, and it is obvious that the numbers would be multiplied if the camps were opened to all able-bodied citizens, irrespective of their ability to pay their own way. This Federal volunteer sentiment, if wisely conserved and administered, will, we believe, lead to a citizenry trained to arms.

I venture to inclose a file of papers which, if you find time to read, will give you pretty much the whole story of this movement. I particularly direct your attention to the copy of my letter to the Senate committee.

Respectfully, yours,
GRENVILLE CLARK,
Secretary, Governing Committee,
Military Training Camps Association of the United States.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, will the Senator permit some inquiries at this point?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. CLAPP. I have not had time to examine the law referred to in section 56. I see it provides that "the President is hereby authorized, at any time, to organize, maintain, and train, under the provisions of section 3 to 12," and so forth. Can the Senator briefly state the concrete effect of those sections?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I will say to the Senator that that was an act passed for raising a volunteer army in time of war, approved April 25, 1914. It is quite long, but it was embodied in the Record the other day. It is Public Document No. 90.

Mr. CLAPP. Does that or this contemplate that these men shall pass an examination such as they would have to pass if they were being enlisted for war?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Oh, yes. They can not go into that service unless they are physically and morally fit.

Mr. CLAPP. They have to be physically fit?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes.

Mr. CLAPP. Then what provision, if any, does it make to meet their expenses?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. It is found on page 160 of the bill:

Officers and enlisted men of the volunteer forces raised under the provisions of this section shall be entitled to the pay and allowances of officers and enlisted men of corresponding grades in the Regular Army during periods of training only.

Mr. CLAPP. Is it expected that that will cover the actual expense? What I am getting at is this: This letter states that these men would be willing to contribute \$50 or \$60 a year. Now, if this section is to remain in the bill, I think it ought to be so worded that a man could show his patriotism and obtain the training that this is supposed to give, even though he might not be able to make that contribution.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. The bill covers the expenses of the men who participate in these encampments. The letter that was just read calls attention to the fact that heretofore they have been participating in the drills and paying their own expenses.

Mr. CLAPP. I know; but I was asking whether this bill contemplated covering the expenses, so that, if a man felt the promptings which would move one in this matter, he could participate in this drill, even though he was not able to stand any of the expense himself?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. It does. It intends to cover that, I will say to the Senator, and the letter which was read here shows that the bill will do it.

Mr. CLAPP. One other question: I have heard a good deal of reference here to 30 days' training under section 56. As I read the section, that is left entirely with the President. I was wondering how it came about that we heard so much reference to it.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, the Senate a few days ago adopted as a committee amendment a proviso, to be added at the end of line 2, page 161, reading as follows:

Provided, That without the consent of Congress such volunteer force shall not be called out for field service for more than a total period exceeding 30 days in any one year.

Mr. CLAPP. That was adopted at a time when I was absent from the Chamber.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes; but, of course, that is subject to amendment, and I understand that some of the Senators will propose an amendment aimed at that.

Mr. President, I had not quite finished addressing myself to some of the remarks of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH]. I want to call the Senator's attention to the fact that if the reserve force attempted to be created here is the subject of ridicule because it is out on a "holiday trip," the same criticism will apply with equal force to the National Guard, for whom the Senator stands here as the sponsor.

I hope that provision will not be stricken from the bill. It has been stated more than once, in Congress and out of Congress, that the greatest piece of constructive military legislation that ever passed the Congress of the United States was that volunteer act approved April 25, 1914, applicable only to the raising of a volunteer force in time of war. It was along the lines of recommendations that have been made by very distinguished officers of the Army, and civilians as well, if you please. We have simply adapted to a time of peace several provisions of an act which was intended to be utilized only in time of war, for the purpose of undertaking to raise a volunteer force; and it seems to me that it ought to be attempted, because even the Senators who criticize this proposition talk about the difficulty of raising a volunteer force. I want to do as much as the Senator from Georgia to make easier the position of the private soldier; but I do not like to hear the Army criticized as it has been, and to hear the officers of the Army criticized as a lot of military martinets. There is not any reason in the world why they should be so termed and so treated.

Why, take it in my own State: I have lived there for 40 years, and I have seen the young men go from the field, the factory, and the workshop to West Point. They have graduated there, and have simply undertaken to follow arms as their profession in life. Now, why should the fact that these sturdy young men have gone to West Point from every walk of life cause them to graduate into a caste that are determined to exer-

cise arbitrary and unjust authority over the young men who come under them? I do not think that condition exists at all, Mr. President.

The Senator from Georgia talks about the vicious and humiliating treatment to which the private soldier is subjected. I wish the Senator would give some instances of that. I have heard that statement made here before. I am sorry the Senator from Georgia did not stay here, because I should like to have him give instances of that treatment. As a matter of fact, it does not exist. There may be individual instances where cruelty is practiced toward the private soldier, just as there are instances where the employer practices acts of cruelty toward the employee; but as a general rule the officer of the Army is a kind, considerate, and humane man. Further than that, the law provides against using the enlisted man in menial service, and he does not perform it, or, if he does, he gets paid for it and adds a little to the salary which the Government pays him. Mr. President, I do hope that the gentlemen who criticize the officers of the Army for the treatment of the private soldier will particularize and show wherein that condition exists. I promise, if they do, our committee will investigate the charges and report conditions.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, as I understand, the pending proposition is to strike out section 56 of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is the pending motion.

Mr. HARDWICK. I desire to state that I am in hearty sympathy with that motion, and hope it will prevail. I think I can demonstrate to the Senate that there is no necessity whatever for the retention of that section in the bill if the Senate will take just one action further on in respect to the creation of a reserve force.

The creation of a volunteer national reserve is of course an act of great importance, and the establishment of such a system as would provide an effective reserve force for our Army is most difficult if the plan recommended by the committee is followed; but it seems to me that if the Government of the United States would utilize the schools and colleges of this country, and the vast number of boys who are attending those schools and colleges, for the purpose of creating a reserve force, there would be no necessity whatever for having anything like a continental army, or anything like a voluntary army as provided in section 56.

We have already determined that we will greatly enlarge the standing army of the United States. I am in hearty accord with the provisions of the bill in that respect. We have already determined, or I think most of the Senators have, that we will increase our aid to the National Guard, and will do all that we can, considering constitutional limitations, to make those organizations as nearly as can be a part of our national Army system. But, Mr. President, those constitutional limitations can be neither forgotten nor ignored. In spite of what some Senators say, the fact remains that these State troops are primarily the troops of 48 separate subdivisions of our Government; and unless we change the present Constitution of the United States there is no way in which these forces can be used as really a first line of reserve.

I thoroughly favor and entirely sympathize with a movement to render service in these organizations more popular, to do what we can in the way of furnishing more arms and more equipment and more financial aid, so that service in these organizations can be made more popular, and will be more generally rendered by the citizens of the 48 States; but, after all, even when that is done, we are going to find ourselves up against this proposition: We will have no real reserve army of the United States; we will have no real force unless we adopt some different plan from any suggested in this bill, because my honest judgment is that section 56, even if it could receive the approval of this body, would never raise a really effective reserve force. Now, how can we raise such a force?

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, would the Senator care to yield?

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes, sir; I yield to the Senator, with pleasure.

Mr. LIPPITT. I presume that the feeling of the Senator is very much in accordance with the feeling of most of the other Senators here—that in this Army bill we want to give as wide an opportunity as possible for the different classes of patriotic American citizens to participate and to prepare themselves to participate in the defense of the country if any unfortunate necessity of that kind should arise.

The Senator has very truly said that some training of that kind can be given to the young men in our schools. The militia affords an opportunity for another class of men—older men, more seasoned men. But there is a third class of men who are not students at the public schools, who are not able to join the

militia on account of their employment and on account of their affiliations in other ways, but who nevertheless would be glad in some way to prepare themselves to take part in the defense of the country.

As I understand, this volunteer army opens an opportunity for those men. For instance, take the case of a traveling salesman. It is impossible for him to join the militia, because the militia requires two or three nights a week of each man's time to be given to it. The salesman is away from home a week at a time, or two or three weeks at a time, perhaps; but he can take concentrated time of two weeks or a month, perhaps, in the summer, to train himself to play a proper part if the occasion arises.

Why is it not wise for Congress to open the door as wide as possible to the patriotic American citizens who want so to prepare themselves? It seems to me that that is the argument that is behind this volunteer army force; and I must say that as I have studied this bill, it appeals to me very strongly indeed.

Mr. HARDWICK. There is force, of course, in the Senator's suggestion, as there usually is in the suggestions of the Senator; but at the same time, in most cases, men even of the kind that the Senator has referred to can join the National Guards and can drill as much as once a week; and the provisions of this bill do not require drilling by the National Guard more than once a week.

Mr. LIPPITT. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, a well-drilled National Guard does drill oftener than once a week. I know that the mounted artillery in my own State, which is a very efficient and enthusiastic organization of young men, gives much more time than that to it. In fact, it is so exacting that a great many of the young men who are anxious to join it have been unable to do so on account of the time it takes. The Senator does not mind my breaking in upon his remarks?

Mr. HARDWICK. Oh, no.

The VICE PRESIDENT. We are drifting back to just the statement of the rules that the Chair made this morning, and the Chair is going to enforce the rule.

Mr. LIPPITT. I beg the pardon of the Chair.

Mr. HARDWICK. I did not understand—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair announced this morning that if a Senator yielded for anything except a question he yielded the floor.

Mr. HARDWICK. I would not care to do that.

Mr. LIPPITT. I do not care to ask it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The rules say that no Senator shall make more than two speeches on any one question without the consent of the Senate.

Mr. GALLINGER. On the same day, of course.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the same day.

Mr. LIPPITT. Then may I ask the Senator if he has also considered the fact that these Plattsburg camps have demonstrated that there is a large body of men who are anxious to take military training, but who could not or did not feel disposed to join the National Guard, and if this volunteer army is not in itself an extension of a system that has already proven its effectiveness?

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, I am still where I was when I started on this question in spite of the Senator's observations. The crack military organizations to which he has referred undoubtedly do drill oftener than once a week, and there are many such throughout the country, but they are the exception rather than the rule. You will find that the military organizations in the State militia, called National Guards in this bill, do not drill on an average more than once a week. I served many years in that organization in my State, and was a captain of the State troops for quite a while; and I know it is quite difficult, with an ordinary military company, to get them to drill as often as once a week. But most of the men in civil life who want the benefits of military training can undoubtedly secure it in these different companies in the State militia, or in the National Guard, if you prefer that term. If there are some instances of men who do not feel that they can belong to the National Guard or to any troop of cavalry or company of infantry or of artillery in that body, provision might well be made for summer training camps along the line of the Senator's suggestion, and in accordance with some experiments already made by this Government. But after all, Mr. President, it seems to me to be almost demonstrable that we can not rely on this system to furnish any considerable number of soldiers, to furnish anything that would do for a real first reserve if this country had to face war with a real power.

Besides that, Mr. President, we do not need to rely on such a plan. There are in this country nearly 2,000,000 boys from 15 to 21 years of age attending the schools, a large majority of whom, in my judgment, would be not only willing but anxious to receive this training. They could receive it in times of peace

without any interference with or disturbance of the business and commercial interests of this country. They could receive it at the time of life when it is most valuable to them. They could receive it at the time when it is most important that they should receive it, because these very young men are the men who would constitute our first battle line if we engaged in a war.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. HARDWICK. I yield to the Senator if he wants to ask me a question and if I may do so without yielding the floor.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is all I will do. I wish to ask the Senator how these boys will be equipped and from what source and in what way they will be drilled?

Mr. HARDWICK. I shall be very glad to answer the Senator's question. I have proposed a bill, which is pending before the Committee on Military Affairs—and I propose to put the proposition in the shape of an amendment to this bill, a very short one—which answers the Senator's question. I would arm them, equip them, and supply them at the expense of the Government of the United States; I would instruct them through commissioned officers detailed for that purpose by the Government of the United States; and I would require of these young men, when they receive these benefits from the Government, simply that they enlist as a part of the reserve forces of the Army of the United States, to be called on for actual military service only in the event that this country should become engaged in war.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, a further question. Does the Senator think that we could spare a very sufficient number of officers to go to the hundreds and thousands of schools throughout the country to instruct the boys?

Mr. HARDWICK. I answer the Senator's question with pleasure. If we have them not already, my proposition provides that we shall create additional officers. I know of no way which would be so fruitful in results as this plan would be. It is recommended by the experience of other countries; it is recommended by the highest military and civic authorities in this country. It seems to me that in the schools and colleges of this country where the young men are of the right age to receive this training with beneficial results to themselves and with the very best results to the country, military instruction ought to be given, and if we will adopt that system instead of the volunteer plan we will not need any volunteer army. We will have the greatest reserve army that this country has ever seen, without the slightest disturbance to the ordinary business and the ordinary industries of the Republic.

Mr. President, the bill contains in sections 42 to 55, inclusive, a plan somewhat along that line, a plan reported by the committee, and yet not the work of the committee, because they have adopted it bodily from a report made by the General Staff and without the slightest change from the report made by the General Staff of the Army.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. May I ask the Senator from Georgia what provision is made for binding these boys, trained by officers detailed to drill them, that they would respond to a demand for their services.

Mr. HARDWICK. I will answer the Senator. My idea would be not to establish a reserve company in any school or college except where the authorities of that school or college requested it and except where the parents or guardians of these young men agree to it, in each individual case where they are minors. These young men would be required to sign a statement that they would become members of the reserve forces of the United States, subject to the rules and regulations laid down by law.

Mr. President, as I was going on to say when the Senator from South Carolina interrupted me, the committee has taken bodily a report from the General Staff of the Army and has provided for a somewhat more general utilization of the schools and colleges of the country than at present by providing that these schools and colleges shall be used under certain terms and regulations prescribed in the bill for the training of reserve officers. So far as it goes the proposition is a good one, and I shall support it most heartily, but it does not go half far enough, because it does not utilize the abundant material we have in the schools for the solution of the most difficult part of this problem. If it is a good thing to train officers in the schools and colleges by the detailing of Army officers to drill them and train them and by equipping them, why is it not also a good thing to train privates in the same way for that reserve? Why should we make at the schools and colleges all officers and no privates? Of course officers are very useful as well as ornamental.

Mr. NELSON. Will the Senator allow me a question?

Mr. HARDWICK. I yield.

Mr. NELSON. Is there not great danger that all these college students when war broke out would want to be officers and none of them privates?

Mr. HARDWICK. I think so, if the Senator will pardon me, if we follow the bill laid down by the committee, because the bill seems to provide for nothing but officers from this source; as I was starting to observe, while officers are not only entirely ornamental and are possibly partially useful, it seems to me privates are just about as useful and fully as necessary if we are going to have any real trouble. If these schools and colleges and high schools throughout the land can be utilized, as the committee contends and as the General Staff recommends, for the training of officers of the reserve corps, then I want to know why is it that 2,000,000 American boys can not also be utilized by training privates, who are fully as necessary if not quite so ornamental as officers?

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. HARDWICK. I yield for a question.

Mr. DU PONT. I understood the Senator from Georgia to say that the officers are of no more use than privates.

Mr. HARDWICK. No; not exactly. I said that officers are useful as well as very ornamental, but we will always find it necessary to have a few privates if we have any real trouble.

Mr. DU PONT. I simply want to call the Senator's attention to the fact that it takes a much longer time to train an officer than it takes to train a private soldier.

Mr. HARDWICK. Undoubtedly. The Senator and I are in no disagreement about that. My point is that with material like the 2,000,000 American boys of ripe age in the schools and colleges of this land, why should we utilize such a tremendous source of military strength only to train officers? Why not train a few privates, too? Why not have your real reserve there? And if we do have our real reserve there we will need no volunteer arm or anything else. Even if 25 per cent—aye, if 10 per cent—of the American schoolboys throughout the United States enlist in this reserve force that my amendment provides for, it does not differ materially from the principle of the provision advanced by the committee and we will have this most splendid reserve that any Republic ever had.

Mr. WARREN. Would they not be volunteers?

Mr. HARDWICK. Undoubtedly; and I would give the schoolboys, volunteers in companies of 50, wherever they are, in town or country, in whatever State, all the necessary equipment, instruction, and everything necessary in order to train them to be soldiers who could render real service to the country if danger arose.

Mr. KENYON. Does the Senator's amendment cover high schools?

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes.

Mr. KENYON. Is there any limit as to the number of students in a school who shall have training?

Mr. HARDWICK. The amendment proposes, of course, an arbitrary one. I had to fix the figure somewhere, and I provided that wherever a school may give 50 or more of these reserve students an officer shall be detailed.

Mr. KENYON. How many officers does the Senator think it would require? Could one officer attend a number of schools?

Mr. HARDWICK. No; I think not.

Mr. KENYON. Would not that be practicable in some cases?

Mr. HARDWICK. That is a question of detail about which the Senator might find himself in agreement with me, but I rather think there should be at least one officer to each school that can furnish as many as 50 or more reserve students.

Mr. KENYON. I am very much interested in the question.

Mr. HARDWICK. I am glad the Senator is. I will say if Senators on both sides of the Chamber will study this question, and if they will not object to the amendment simply because the committee has not proposed it in the exact form in which I have presented it, I believe it will get the votes of two-thirds of the Senators.

Mr. JONES. Does the Senator contemplate that the students in the schools shall, for instance, drill every day?

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes; every day. It would be a part of the regular school training. On Saturdays they would have more extended drill; they could drill out in the country; it may be do rifle practice and such things as that. On vacations, according to the terms of my amendment, they would be mobilized in regiments or brigades or even divisions, if you want to. That is the only time we pay anything for the service. They will not want any pay except for that service. It will do the boys of this country a great deal of good to assemble in brigades

and divisions during the summer vacation and let them camp and drill and see something of real soldiering.

Mr. JONES. If they should be required to drill, however, only two or three times a day, it seems to me one officer could take care of two or three schools.

Mr. HARDWICK. Of course, those are matters of detail that we might agree about.

Mr. CLAPP. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. HARDWICK. Certainly.

Mr. CLAPP. I shall transgress the rules slightly by prefacing the question with the statement that I am heartily in favor of some such plan as the Senator suggests. What I want to ask the Senator is how section 56 would interfere with the plan outlined by the Senator?

Mr. HARDWICK. In answer to the Senator's question I will state that it does not interfere with it except in this way and in this view: If you adopt the plan I have suggested, you have no need of section 56. There is absolutely no necessity for any further reserve force than you will get under the plan I have offered to the Senate. You will not need the other. If any Senator thinks we would need the other, too, I do not care particularly about it one way or the other. I shall vote to strike out section 56, as far as my own vote is concerned, because I regard it as entirely unnecessary if we are going to adopt anything like the plan I have suggested.

Mr. CLAPP. The Senator has little thought that these boys under his plan would ever go to the battle front. I will put it in the form of an inquiry. Is his suggestion not based upon the fact of the benefit it would be to the citizenship of the country to give the boys this training, and is not that equally true of the younger manhood of the country that has passed the school age?

Mr. HARDWICK. I think so; but answering the Senator frankly, as I answered the Senator from Rhode Island just now, I do think in the large majority of cases at least the younger manhood of the country, out of schools to which the Senator refers, would get the training in connection with the State troops or the National Guard.

Mr. CLAPP. Is not the Senator aware that there is a large proportion of our people who from their vocation and their condition do not find it convenient to be in the National Guard? In other words, dealing now with citizenship and not with war, is it not our duty to carry to the entire younger portion of our citizenship at least that inspiration, that development of ideals and physical advantage of training which would come from the National Guard, the volunteer army, and the school plan outlined by the Senator?

Mr. HARDWICK. I do not find myself in violent disagreement with the Senator on that proposition. I agree with him thoroughly in this view of the matter, that the training—mental, moral, and physical—that American schoolboy would get through this discipline would be available to him in peace as well as in war; it would make a better citizen of him as well as a more efficient soldier, if we needed him for the latter purpose.

Mr. DU PONT. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. HARDWICK. Certainly; I yield.

Mr. DU PONT. The young men the Senator proposes to instruct in the manner he has stated, I understand, could not be organized permanently into the establishment. They would be simply military assets to be used in case of war in the formation of new units or new organizations. Is not that it?

Mr. HARDWICK. No; that is not the plan I have in mind at all.

Mr. DU PONT. What is it?

Mr. HARDWICK. The plan I have in mind is that wherever you can get a company of as many as 50 of these young men from 15 years of age upward you form them into a company, and during school term itself you could not have a larger unit probably than these companies, except in the larger schools, like the public schools of New York, or it may be the public schools of Atlanta or Chicago or some other larger cities of the country, but during the vacation of about three months of every year you can form larger units, brigades, divisions.

Mr. DU PONT. I understand.

Mr. HARDWICK. In the corps of these reserve forces these young men are trained to act together.

Mr. DU PONT. I understand that.

Mr. HARDWICK. Of course it might not be the precise unit in which you would use these reserve soldiers in case war broke out, although as far as possible the organization already made during times of peace and in vacation and the units already employed during those times ought to be followed in time of war.

Mr. DU PONT. The Senator would take a school and organize it every year in this way? A certain number of them would every year leave the school and disappear, would they not?

Mr. HARDWICK. Undoubtedly.

Mr. DU PONT. The Senator's idea would be, in case of war, to call out the schoolboys representing these units? Is that the idea?

Mr. HARDWICK. Undoubtedly, to some extent.

Mr. DU PONT. Then you would have an army composed to a large extent of young men between 15 and 20 years of age who enlisted in the service of the United States with the consent of their parents and guardians. Is that the idea?

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes, sir; that is it exactly.

Now, Mr. President, there are other advantages which the Senator's question suggests. It is true that these boys are going out into civil life every year, and they go out with some training; and that, as a Senator suggests to me, is one of the strongest virtues of the plan. As they go out their places will be taken by younger boys, and year after year in this country you will have a constantly increasing force of young men who do know something about military affairs, who could render efficient service to this country in time of danger, and at the same time, as they went out into civil life, class after class of younger men coming would take their places, so that we would have a reserve force, constantly expanding in numbers, without a constantly expanding increase.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President—

Mr. HARDWICK. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. WARREN. I agree with very much the Senator has said about universal military education, but I want to ask the Senator, if I understood him correctly, to say that he thought there are some constitutional difficulties to get over in regard to the National Guard? I assume that he meant to ask whether the guards could be used in an adjoining country. The Senator believes that they could not under the Constitution.

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes, sir.

Mr. WARREN. Very well. At the present time, as the Senator knows, and he will correct me if I am wrong, we have no reserves.

Mr. HARDWICK. The Senator is right.

Mr. WARREN. We are providing for reserves in this bill. It takes two years to accomplish it. We hope to have them. What would the Senator do, if matters which I hope may not terminate so but I believe the chances are 4 to 5 they will so terminate, about being compelled to go into an adjoining country to pacify conditions? Where would we get the forces?

Mr. HARDWICK. Of course, I can see only one answer to the Senator's question. As far as the reserves are concerned—troops outside of the Regular Army—we would have to depend on the enlistment of the militia into the Federal force. You could not take them as militia; but brigade after brigade, and regiment after regiment, and company after company they may enlist, and they would be used to fight.

Mr. WARREN. And thus they would become United States Volunteers.

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes; they would. I think that is what would happen.

Mr. WARREN. In the meantime, following exactly the Senator's question, is it not safer to have a force of volunteers who, for reasons of their own, are not going into the National Guard or the Regular Army and are in some manner trained and organized in troops and in companies, so that they may be called immediately, rather than to depend at the present time upon the youth the Senator mentions, none of whom, if their parents objected, could enlist? Would it not be better to not depend entirely upon the National Guard, as the Senator knows many of those could not go?

Mr. HARDWICK. Answering the Senator's question, I beg to say that I very much doubt, under the present condition, whether you would get anything like an efficient reserve force from this volunteer provision known as section 56. I do not believe you would get it. I do not believe you would get enough men to even hunt down a bandit in Mexico under such a provision.

Mr. WARREN. Does the Senator mean that they would not enlist or that having enlisted they would not go?

Mr. HARDWICK. I do not mean to imply that the people, after they once assumed the obligation, would fail in patriotism, but I do not think the system is attractive to the business men of the country or that any considerable number would be willing to embrace it.

Mr. WARREN. Yet, if the Senator will permit me, many may want to go who, being instructed, would become volunteers in the Regular Army.

Mr. HARDWICK. If the Senator will permit me, I spoke just now about these camps. How many really have been to these camps?

Mr. WARREN. In the various camps probably 10,000 or 12,000 out of an organization of 60,000, all of whom are represented as anxious to join such a force.

Mr. HARDWICK. As far as these camps are concerned, I believe they are a good thing. I am perfectly willing to join the Senator to an extent that would result in an improvement in that direction. So far, the encampment of 12,000 or 15,000 men of all the millions in this country does not indicate any general desire on the part of a large number of our citizens to embrace that opportunity.

Mr. WARREN. I answer the Senator that it is in its incipency. Last year was the first, and it was the opinion of the committee that if we were to provide means for support during the time of training we had better do it, and there would be a dependable force, one that by obligation places itself at the command of the Government as volunteers. We might start with 30-day camps at half a dozen places. They have an association of sixty-odd thousands, and it is only a matter of one or two months once a year. Is it not fair to presume that there would be a very much larger number in following seasons and finally a very considerable force, compared with the little Regular Army we have now?

Mr. HARDWICK. I do not know whether there has been any difference owing to this reason. Those encampments have been held at a time when the minds of the people of the country were greatly excited by the talk of war and rumors of war all over the world, and it looks to me like if the scheme was ever going to appeal to the American citizen in large numbers this is particularly the time of all times when it would appeal to them and that even the first year we would have had better results than we did under the experiment so far.

Be that as it may, however, I am perfectly willing to have summer camps. I am perfectly willing to have the Government establish and maintain them wherever American citizens want to avail themselves of the advantages they offer. The Senator can not rely, however, on a volunteer force made up under existing circumstances and conditions in this country of these business men.

In every country in every age the very flower of the country's soldiery has come from the young men of the country, from 16 to 21 or 22 years of age. If we had a war in this country tomorrow with a power of first magnitude, so that American patriotism was stirred to its very depths and so that the resources as well as the patriotism of this country were taxed, you would find it would be these young boys out of the schools who would do our fighting; that they would be the first to volunteer and the first in battle when it came to defending this country.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President—

Mr. HARDWICK. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator, I think, is right, so far as the young men being ready. I think boys are more enthusiastic than are men. An observation was made as to the laboring men. The Senator knows whether we want to discuss that question or not. He knows the laboring people do not go into the National Guard to any great extent under the present plan; that there is a widespread prejudice against the National Guard because of possible local or police duties they might be called upon to perform.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Pardon me, that is not true of Mississippi.

Mr. WARREN. I presume you do not have those large united communities of laboring people who make known their wants as organizations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Again Senators are paying absolutely no attention to the rules.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, since the Chair has called attention to it, I do not yield the floor until I have concluded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia has yielded three or four times.

Mr. HARDWICK. I will yield altogether if the Chair so rules.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair simply wants to place this discussion in a shape so that the rule may be obeyed by the Senate.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. HARDWICK. Now, I had very nearly finished what I want to say about this measure. Anyway, I think I can sum it up in just a few sentences.

I have no objection to these military camps. I have no serious objection to this section 56 providing for a volunteer force. The main objection I have had is because I believe it will not

accomplish much. I believe if we are to have a real reserve army in this country we shall have to rely upon our schools and colleges to furnish its very backbone and its flower.

So far as the proposition presented by the committee, or rather by the General Staff, is concerned, I want to say here and now that I am going a little later to request the vote of the Senate on why it is if the schools and colleges can be utilized to furnish officers for the reserve corps of the Army that they can not also, and ought also as a matter of fact to some extent, be utilized to furnish privates for the reserve corps. Why should we not use every resource in this country in the most sensible and the most economical and the most practical way in our attempt to solve this vexatious and troublesome question? Therefore I say instead of this volunteer army, instead of this reserve corps of officers, in connection with the schools and colleges of this country, at the proper time and as soon as we vote on this motion, if I may then have the opportunity, I propose to offer as a substitute that we shall establish a reserve force of the Army of the United States in every school and college in this country where both students and school authorities favor the establishment and are willing to take the benefit of the training, the equipment, and the instruction that the Government of the United States shall provide.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, there has been very much, indeed, in what the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] has said, nor is it altogether a new thing. The thought has been entertained by a great many people who have stood very high in leadership in America. I can see, however, no conflict between what he desires to do and section 56 of the bill. They aim to accomplish different purposes, and each of them can be left to accomplish its purpose in its own way. There is no reason why the people who are willing to go out and be trained for 30 or 60 or 90 days every summer should be shut out because there is a desire to make a reserve force of the students of the country between 15 and 21.

Mr. President, I rose simply to say this: Something has been said about training officers, and there seems to be an idea that it is just as important to train privates as it is to train officers. That is absolutely unfounded, because you can train a private in very much less time, and you require a very much less broad field of preparation to make a good private than to make a competent officer.

If this war in Europe has proved anything at all, it has proved the necessity of such a provision as sections 48 up to 50, I believe, in the bill, inclusive. The Russians and the English both have found that much out. The English Government had to turn its corporals and its sergeants into commissioned officers to train troops. Then it had to look elsewhere for noncommissioned officers. There is very little doubt about the fact that the Russian Army was beaten back just as much by the lack of officers to train their privates, who came by the million, but who had no one competent to train them and no one competent to lead them, as it was at first defeated by the lack of munitions of war.

Mr. President, everybody seems to be using this bill as a vehicle whereby to transport into the public attention some favorite idea of his own. I also want to bring out one of mine. I think that every State university in this Union can be turned into a West Point for the purpose of training officers at an expense of not over twenty to thirty thousand dollars a year for each State university. The State universities already contain as a rule everything taught at West Point except two things. They have an engineering course, which might perhaps in many cases be made better. They have an electrical engineering course, nearly all of them, if not every one. They have the ordinary course in history and literature and modern languages, which West Point has. They have the ordinary course in pure and applied mathematics, which West Point has.

Now, if the Government of the United States were to detail to each one of the 48 State universities two professors, one of tactics and drill and the other of strategy and military history, they would thereby build up a military curriculum akin to that existing at West Point, and it would cost them nothing to detail the officers. All the Federal Government would have to spend for the students of the State universities, which are public institutions, where for the most part in nearly all the States the students get their schooling without paying a dollar for tuition, and the students therefore owe something to the country, would be enough money to equip them with their uniforms, their guns, their artillery, and in certain cases their horses, where they were going to have cavalry companies.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President—

Mr. WILLIAMS. In one moment. Take some of the great universities out West and the large universities in Wisconsin and Illinois.

Mr. CLAPP. And Minnesota.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And Minnesota and Iowa. There the number of students runs up into the thousands.

This is not a new idea. Mr. Jefferson, in founding the first university in this country, wanted the university to provide a professor in military science, as he called it, so that all the boys at the university who volunteered for that purpose should have the advantage of taking military science as one of their studies, along with the other studies which they took, and taking a degree at the end of their course in military science as well. Of course, the degree in military science would carry not only tactics and strategy, but military history, engineering, and the things that are absolutely necessary to equip an officer, the only difference being that, under his idea, the State of Virginia was to pay for it all, of course, and not the Federal Government; but the State was never rich enough to do so. The university even yet has no such school; but his idea was that 100 or 200 students would volunteer every year, or, since the university has grown to larger proportions, I dare say 500 now would volunteer, receive this excellent training, and form a reserve corps of trained officers learned in military science, educated and equipped to lead and to train men.

Mr. President, if you take the ordinary American citizen, and you put him through an intensive course of drill, you could make a pretty well-equipped private soldier of him, I believe, in six months. They talk about two years being a short period of enlistment. With intensive drill you can make of that man a good soldier, toughened, hardened, ready for almost any test, because he is highly intelligent, highly initiative and enterprising, and you can make a good noncommissioned officer out of him.

Mr. President, it seems to me that some of the most valuable parts of this bill are section 48 and the sections following it. I hope that if the Senator from Georgia does offer his amendment he will offer it in such a way as not to cancel those sections but to coordinate his amendments with them. I see no reason why there should be any conflict between his idea, as he expressed it a moment ago, and section 56.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will yield for a question.

Mr. POMERENE. Senators were referring to sections of the bill from 48 to 52. I want to call the attention of the Senator from Mississippi to sections 42, 43, and 44, which provide for extending facilities to different classes of universities. Section 42 calls attention to what are known as the land-grant colleges, section 43 to such institutions as are organized under State laws, and section 44 to other established institutions of learning.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, I understand; but that does not quite go as far as my idea. I want to detail not only drill masters, but I want to detail professors, or men who shall go there as professors, of strategy and of military science, and professors of military engineering, and that the Federal Government could do. After it did that by furnishing from two to three men at each State university—at the utmost three—you would have a full faculty for military training at each State university, just as you have at West Point, because the State universities already have all the other branches.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, I think it was unfortunate that section 56 was entitled "The Volunteer Army." It in no sense creates any army. It simply provides for there existing among the body of our citizenship men who by previous training, and having already taken the oath, may be organized into an army at any time when needed. I regret that there has grown up here any difference between the different forces that might constitute the fighting force of this country in time of war. It seems to me, as a people and as a deliberative body, we have too much fallen into the habit of taking it for granted that we must have this or that particular thing, and that everything else must be rejected.

I am a believer in and would be the last man to strike a blow at the National Guard. As it is growing and developing, it would be our main reliance aside from the standing army in case of a war of any magnitude. I have long believed that this Government could well afford to make a large contribution annually to the National Guard, not primarily for war purposes, for there is slight prospect of war, although it would be there if needed, but that it might take the young men who would join the National Guard and give them the benefits of out-of-door camp life; give them the benefits of the discipline, which every young man ought to have; and, at the same time, keep alive the symbol of patriotism, which, in a Republic, must be the military thought, more especially the military tradition.

I do not believe in a large standing army, and I think the committee is to be congratulated at the result of its labor and deliberations, in view of the pressure that has been upon them, in bringing to the Senate such a moderate bill as this as to that part which relates to the standing army; but I do believe that we can well afford to devote a certain amount of public funds to the development among our people, especially among our young men, of that spirit out of which would come the soldier, if there ever comes a time—which God forbid—again in our history when any considerable number of soldiers will be required.

The National Guard exists year after year. Out from its ranks, year after year, go drilled men, with 10, 15, or perhaps 20 years of their life left within that active period where, if they were required, they could serve in the Army. Believing in that principle, I believe, after making provision for the standing army that is provided for, that the next question that should be considered at every point is where will the money that we propose to collect by taxation and appropriate do the greatest good, combining the thought of a citizenship, qualified to fight, if ever the time to do so should come, but in the meantime the development of the citizen himself along mental, physical, and moral lines. This is accomplished by the creation and development of the National Guard. If we have not made ample provision therefor, it should be made. We have already amended this bill to put officers from the National Guard upon the General Staff.

For the very reason that I have always believed that we should expend money upon the National Guard I believe in the provisions of section 56. It ought to have been entitled "The annual training camp" or some term like that. To call it a volunteer camp is misleading, for it provides for no army. It simply provides for making the material out of which, if occasion ever arose, an army could be created.

We know that there are in this country men who for various reasons can not join the National Guard, but who can give a reasonable amount of time each summer to an encampment, and that is really what section 56 provides for, that encampment resulting along the same lines of good that service in the National Guard does; in other words, it gives them an out-of-door experience; it gives them discipline, and keeps alive in them that patriotic spirit that comes, in the last analysis, much as we might be prone to regret it, from military traditions. Nor do I think, perhaps, we should regret it. Our achievements in the past have been military achievements, and they are the inspiration to a free people for the ideals and standards of citizenship in time of peace.

Why should there be any conflict between these two? Why should there be any conflict between either of these and the school proposition advocated by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH]? I think, Senators, if we would get out of the thought that we must always have this thing or nothing, that what we advocate is the sole thing, and that what some one else advocates is full of danger and harm, and recognize that there is a broad equation to be served, we would make much headway toward wiser and more permanent legislation. I therefore felt that it was only proper that I should make these few brief remarks.

I found my support of section 56 upon the same broad principle that I found my support of the school training and of the National Guard, namely, that we are developing in the youth of our country those traits, that physical, moral, and mental training, which will fit them alike for civil or military duties, if the occasion ever requires; and the more thoroughly a man is fitted for that occasion, if it ever comes, the better fitted he is, in my judgment, for the duties and the experiences of civil life.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Oregon a question with respect to one of the terms of section 56. On line 21, referring to the men who are expected to enlist in the so-called volunteer army, this language occurs:

Those passing to the reserve to have the status and obligations prescribed for reserves of the Regular Army.

In another part of the bill it is provided that the Regular Army reserves are to be paid \$24 a year. Does the language in section 56 indicate that the reserves of the volunteer army for four years are to draw the \$24 a year from the Federal Government?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I do not think the committee so intended.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is rather an important matter, Mr. President.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. It may be that some provision might have to be made to more clearly express the intent, but I think

that the \$24 per annum was intended for the Regular Army. I will ask the Senator from Wyoming if that is not his understanding?

Mr. WARREN. Yes.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The language is:

Those passing to the reserve to have the status and obligations prescribed for reserves of the Regular Army.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I think the committee intended that they should have the military status, being subject to the call of the President, but we did not intend to have the \$24 per annum paid to those men.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Is the Senator from Oregon confident that under that section those men will not be able to claim that amount?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I would not say that without examining the language a little more critically than I have done. The Senator from New York is the first person who has suggested the matter to me. I will say, however, that was not the intent of the committee. It was only intended that that language should apply to those men who had served out their enlistment under the colors and had gone into the reserve.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Will the Senator, with his usual generosity, yield for another question on the general purpose of this section? Am I to understand that this volunteer army, to be composed of 260,000 troops, is to be actually a force in being?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I so understand.

Mr. WADSWORTH. A force in being?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Organized, then, into brigades, regiments, battalions, squadrons, companies, troops, and batteries?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. If enough men enlist; yes.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Well, Mr. President—

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President—

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WEEKS. I was going to ask the chairman of the committee if it is not a fact that this provision is experimental in its character? No one knows that 260,000 men can be obtained, or 100,000 or 50,000. We had assurance from those largely interested in the camps last year that there would probably be from thirty to forty thousand men who would come into a service of this kind in this way; but I do not think there is any assurance that there will be a greater number at this time, and it may not be possible even to get that many.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. The Senator is correct about that. It is experimental, but it is along the line of the recommendations of men who have had more or less experience in this service. The committee has had to meet the question of how best to create some sort of reserve, and met it with this experimental provision, adopting in times of peace provisions which had been enacted to apply to times of war.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President—

Mr. WADSWORTH. I very gladly yield again to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WEEKS. I do not think it violates the committee's secrets in any way to say that the general proposition of a volunteer army was not perhaps favorably considered by the committee until there was an assurance that the men who had attended the volunteer camps would be willing to enlist, become volunteer reserves, and serve as the Government required in that capacity.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. That is true. It was a question whether the men who had been taking part in these encampments would enlist so that they would be subject to the call of the President. The matter was taken up with men who were interested in the movement in different parts of the country, and they expressed a perfect willingness to have the bill so framed that they should really become a part of the enlisted strength of the United States Army.

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me for a moment?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the Senator from Delaware for a question.

Mr. DU PONT. I merely wish to say, Mr. President, that this assurance came from the Volunteer Training Camps Association. They have formed a national organization, and their officers were believed to represent all those who were interested in the training camps throughout the country. So, the assurance was official, and to the committee at least, of a satisfactory nature.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, the point of my inquiry was not to develop how many men were to be recruited or whether it would be possible to recruit 260,000; the point of my inquiry was to ascertain, if possible, whether it was intended to maintain these men in organizations, fully equipped

and ready to take the field at the outbreak of war. The inquiry has some importance, I think, in connection with the estimated cost. It is proposed that these men shall attend training camps 30 days in the year. I am fairly familiar with "the Plattsburg idea," so-called. It is a most excellent idea, but no one can contend that the 1,200-odd men who attended the camp at Plattsburg for five or six weeks last summer have been maintained, or could be maintained, for the succeeding 11 months in a regimental organization. To begin with, they have no place whatsoever to store their equipment; and the impedimenta of a regiment of Infantry is a very sizable thing to take into consideration. At least 24 great army wagons are necessary for the transport train of one regiment of Infantry. My inquiry is to that point. Is this to be an army, or is it not to be an army, but simply a group of men in training and not organized into units? The Senator from Minnesota, as I gather, understands it in the latter sense.

Mr. CLAPP. Certainly.

Mr. WADSWORTH. But the Senator from Oregon, the chairman of the committee, replies that it is to be a force in being; and there is a very grave distinction between the two. One might go on for some time indicating the amount of work, the amount of money, the amount of building necessary to house the equipment for an army of 260,000 men; likewise the number of headquarters that would have to be maintained, the number of officers who must be permanently detailed to those regiments or brigades or squads or battalions or companies or troops, for it must be understood, of course that, in any such recruiting, the units will be scattered all over the United States; and yet each unit must have quarters at some place in which to store its material and equipment.

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. President, I should like to say, if the Senator will pardon an interruption, that the bill provides that there is to be one Regular Army officer detailed in each congressional district to look out for all those things.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, it is exceedingly easy to detail an officer to take charge of men recruited in a given congressional district, but what I am endeavoring to find out is whether there will be, we will say, the Tenth United States Volunteer Infantry, ready to take the field, or the Fifteenth United States Volunteer Cavalry, ready to take the field, trained, it is true, for only 30 days, but in possession of headquarters, in possession of buildings in which their impedimenta may be stored and protected from the weather and from fire risk, buildings in which the men can gather and take possession of their equipment in time of war on the outbreak of hostilities—headquarters at which they can mobilize? Are these units to have continuous life through the years, or are the men simply to attend 30 days training camps and then disperse and return to civil life, with no permanent organization and with no control over them during the other 11 months of the year?

When we come to consider the matter of supplies and impedimenta we must also understand that animals must be had for the equipment of this great army, and if it is to be an army—and I am trying to develop that fact—it is going to take thousands of horses, and what is to happen to the horses for the other 11 months? Who is to feed them?

I do not believe that that item is contained in the estimate of \$25,000,000 as the cost of this force; and if these things have not been considered, if these units of the Volunteer Army are not to be placed on the basis of a permanent organization, with appropriate headquarters, a place for storing material and at which the men may gather, then it is not an army.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President, in connection with what has just been said by the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that amongst the valuable assets that this genuine American institution, the citizen soldiery or the National Guard, have is the support, the liberal support, of the States. The amount appropriated—and this is official information—by the States for the construction, upkeep, and repair of armories for the last fiscal year was \$1,942,780; for rentals of armories, \$740,817; for caretakers for armories, \$704,000; making a total for armories annually appropriated by the States of \$3,387,733, and not including new armories being annually provided for.

Mr. President, the points made by the Senator from New York are absolutely apposite to this situation. Now comes this proposition to improvise a volunteer army, so called, to compete with and to overthrow, if possible, the old and established form of citizen soldiery in this country. Instead of perfecting the one, which should be done, this bill aims to undermine the large existing investment in the National Guard and to interfere with the purpose of our country with respect to its citizen soldiery, the power to arm, organize, and discipline the militia, long a dormant power, but now it is hoped to be effectively exercised.

In this connection I want to call attention to the fact that the amendment which I have in contemplation does not propose to reduce the forces available for preparedness, but would strike out and then double the limitation which the committee has put upon the number of National Guard. This limitation they have placed at 500 for each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives. I would make the limitation 1,000, giving a substantial increase in probable troops over and above the number of the experimental volunteer army.

In that connection also the House bill made the limitation of the National Guard 800, whereas the Senate committee has brought in a limitation of 500. That can not be out of friendliness to the National Guard. The committee must have realized the inconsistency between the National Guard and the volunteer type which they propose, and must have contemplated a reduction of the National Guard to that extent.

Mr. President, the idea of multiplying types is an unsound military proposition. We have two types. We have the Regular soldier. Do what you can for him; make him as good as possible; pay him as much as you can; discipline him as highly as you can; pay his officers as much as you can afford; and give him every convenience of education which has been suggested. Then, you have the other type—the citizen soldier mentioned in the Constitution. Stick to that. Do not multiply types. In Army affairs it is always well to have uniformity; have guns that shoot the same cartridge; have a type of citizen soldier that will meet the requirements; but do not give the crustacean Army officer an opportunity to play two types of citizen soldiery against one another. There are some crustacean Army officers. The Army officers of this country as a class are as brave, as honest, as loyal, and as faithful professional men as any other professional men in the country; yet they have their crustacean types, and that type of officer has an undue power by reason of the reverence which the Army pays to seniority. It would be unwise to afford an opportunity to retard a great movement or to curb the citizen soldier's development by a privileged or to be petted volunteer-army proposition.

Mr. President, I have another amendment in contemplation which I wish to discuss very briefly in connection with what was said by the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK]. He suggested a volunteer system for schools. I propose to add a new section to come in after section 98, and to read as follows:

SEC. —. National Guard units at civilian schools: At colleges and schools approved by the President, and under such special regulations as he may provide (applicable or not applicable to other units of the National Guard), there may be organized and composed, in whole or in part of the students of such schools or colleges, specified units of the National Guard—

Why have them volunteers? Why get another type? Can they not enlist and become National Guardsmen in the community where the school is located?

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Certainly.

Mr. HARDWICK. Does not the Senator regard it as desirable for the United States to have some reserve force—

Mr. LEE of Maryland. That is the idea exactly—

Mr. HARDWICK. Just a moment; let me finish—which is not subject to any constitutional limitations as to the manner in which they may be employed in the service of the Government even in time of war?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Well, the three great purposes mentioned in the Constitution—to repel invasions, suppress insurrections, and enforce the laws—are pretty much everything that I want to see soldiers used for, with very few exceptions.

Mr. HARDWICK. That may be true; but the Senator can very readily understand that the country might be involved in many troublesome situations where we would have to go further than that.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. We would have no difficulty in getting the men if the situation were serious.

Mr. HARDWICK. But we have got to provide some proper method of meeting that situation, have we not?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Unquestionably. We are increasing the Regular Army up to 250,000 men, and we are doing other things that will increase the forces of this country. We are proposing to increase the naval force; and then there is the Marine Corps, which is now really our over-seas diplomatic force in one sense. But to go on with the suggestion of National Guard units at civilian schools, my proposed amendment continues—

and whose term of enlistment and manner of service may be arranged in relation to the scholastic year or course of study in such schools or colleges.

The commissioned officers of such specified units shall be entitled to one-fourth of the pay of an officer in the Regular Army; those de-

talled from the Regular Army to receive all the pay and allowances of their rank; and the enlisted men while in actual service, and as may be provided by such special regulations, to receive the pay of enlisted men in the United States Army with a ration or commutation therefor, or such part of such pay or ration as the President may direct.

Thus, Mr. President, there would be no trouble about an army. There is a legitimate opportunity for the youth of this country of the age to become soldiers to enlist and to receive the pay and rations, or such part of the pay and rations as the President may see fit under regulations to give them. You can attach that unit to any school in this country, have the unit large or small as you like, and at the same time preserve uniformity in military matters, have this military unit subject to the provisions and regulations that apply to the National Guards of the several States, and do away with the disadvantageous condition that is necessarily incident to setting up a different type of soldier, available under different conditions, and to be, perhaps, the petted favorite of some military clique, or, if not, to be of a type that will not enlist and follow the colors of his country with the average of his countrymen.

We want to have the youth of this country follow the flag. The suggestion that has come here from the secretary of this association that these summer camps will democratize a certain type of youth is a manifest error, Mr. President, except with reference to a very limited class of youth. If you want to democratize your youth, let them enlist and follow the flag as National Guardsmen of the several States, or let them enlist and follow the flag as enlisted soldiers of the United States; and if there is any limitation upon their means to get an education or opportunities to serve full enlistments when at schools or colleges, that can be recognized by the regulations of the President, and due consideration shown under those circumstances.

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Certainly.

Mr. DU PONT. I should like to ask the Senator from Maryland how the youth of the country who had enrolled themselves in the National Guard could make themselves useful in case of operations in foreign countries?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. That was suggested by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK], but in view of the fact that this bill gives us 250,000 regular soldiers for overseas operations how many more does the Senator want?

Mr. DU PONT. Not 250,000.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. That is the maximum possible number in the bill which the committee has just reported. In addition to that there would be added the marine and naval resources the United States.

Mr. DU PONT. Oh, that is in time of war—yes.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Certainly.

Mr. HARDWICK. But, Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me for a question—

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Certainly.

Mr. HARDWICK. If we got into a war with a power of first magnitude, a real power—something other than a Mexican war, or something like that—we would need a great many more than that, as the Senator very well knows.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Certainly.

Mr. HARDWICK. Does the Senator agree to that?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I should say so.

Mr. HARDWICK. Therefore, why not have your school reserves free from these constitutional difficulties that hedge about the State troops? Of course the Senator will understand that I am in favor of doing everything we can for the National Guard. I am not opposing any of his propositions for them; but I see no reason for taking your school reserves, that ought to be the real flower of your Army, and putting them under the same constitutional limitations and inhibitions that the National Guard rest under.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. The inhibitions and limitations of the National Guard are extremely small, and apply only to these over-sea operations, and yet in that case there would be little or no difficulty, in the very twinkling of an eye, in changing these forces by an universal enlistment to just the types of volunteer forces that are provided for under existing law. This very section 56 applies to existing law, and makes that existing law, which was never operative in this country before except in time of war, operative now in time of peace, and adds a centralized force in excess of anything that was contemplated by Gen. Emory Upton as a reformer of the military policies of this country.

Gen. Upton's suggestions, if applied to the population of this country to-day, would give us 206,000 men in the Regular Army.

His theory was 1,000 men for every million population in the Regular Army, and, I think, 200 for every Congressman and Senator, which would be 100,000, and 106,000, or a total of 206,000 men in the Army subject to the orders of the President of the United States. That was his conception, and at a time when the power of the disciplined and equipped soldier was much less, relatively to unarmed population, than that power is now. The provision of the bill, with 250,000 Regular Army in time of war and 261,000 volunteers, or over 500,000 National Guard, if these amendments are adopted, would recognize to some extent the larger masses in modern war and improved means of ocean transportation not available when Gen. Upton wrote, and when we were less exposed than now to foreign attack.

Mr. President, I certainly hope that we will not multiply types, but that we will go on and increase the National Guard to the degree that it ought to be increased for the protection of this country, especially from invasion. We have to harmonize many thoughts and many ideas in this legislation, and I hope that behind a genuine citizen soldiery there will be no lack of congressional unanimity or of appropriation to make those soldiers fit in every particular.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I hardly think the Senator from Maryland, on second thought, would say that section 56 would increase the number of types of soldiers contemplated. Neither do I think he would, upon reflection, consider that a man who might volunteer in the service of his country under section 56 would do so in contemplation of being the "gilded pet of some clique of Army officers," as he expressed it.

Any force organized under section 56 would, under the terms of the section, be organized under the provisions of sections 3 to 12 of the act approved April 25, 1914, which provides for exactly the same type of soldier for which section 56 provides. The type of soldier which the Senator from Maryland thinks is to be newly created and organized is already provided for under this act, and the only thing section 56 does is to make the act approved April 25, 1914, apply during times of peace as well as during times of war and when war is imminent.

For the benefit of those who are interested in seeing what are the provisions of the act of April 25, 1914, that being existing law, I will say that it is printed on page 5829 and the following page of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under date of March 29, 1916.

Mr. President, I think section 56 of this bill is one of the most valuable parts of the whole bill—valuable in that I think in time emergency there is at least a possibility that some good might come out of it.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. LEE] and other Senators have taken occasion to say that we can rely, in case of emergency, to augment our first line of defense—which, in case of an invasion of this country by the veteran troops of other countries, the General Board has estimated would take a force of about 500,000 men—upon the militia of the several States, who, commendable as they may be and efficient as they may be in the several States, train, as has been described here, on an average of one night a week in an armory under shelter. These gentlemen who want to rely upon separate organizations in the several States of the State militia, under the officers appointed by the governors of the States, to form an efficient aid to the Regular Army of the United States to repel an invasion or to conduct one, seem to me to be basing their hopes upon something that in the past has always met with disaster; and, in my opinion, unless in some way, under the constitutional authority granted, the State troops can be drilled and trained efficiently to the approval and satisfaction of the commander-in-chief, will in the future prove to be a broken reed.

Mr. President, the Senator from Maryland skips very lightly over the constitutional inhibitions against the successful use of the State troops in the first line of defense. What we want in this country, if I correctly apprehend the situation and the feeling of the people, is an effective, well-drilled, well-trained Army in time of emergency. It is not sufficient, in my opinion, after the emergency is upon us in time of war that then the President may call into the service of the United States the troops of the several States and commence to train them and discipline them and give them the necessary endurance to act with the Regulars. I do not think the people will be satisfied with that kind of preparedness. Mr. President, that is no preparedness at all.

I admit freely that the State troops—their efficiency varies in the several States—are, so far as they go and to the extent to which they are trained and to which they are competent, of course in advance of any green volunteers that could be raised on the spur of the moment; and they have some equipment, and that could all be availed of. But one of the purposes and objects of section 56 is that in time of peace the President, if

he apprehends an emergency and desires to call upon the country for volunteers, may obtain a supply of men that he can put into camp and discipline and train in the field, and not in armories, to supplement the Regular force of the United States.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER [Mr. SAULSBURY in the chair]. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to call the Senator's attention to section 91, which provides for the training of the National Guard and provides that they "shall, in addition thereto, participate in encampments, maneuvers, or other exercises, including outdoor target practice, at least 24 days each year."

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I thank the Senator for calling my attention to the section. The trouble is that the provisions of the committee bill and of the Hay bill which are mandatory in tone are not mandatory in fact, and can not be made so under the Constitution of the United States.

The militia need not, in time of peace, come out at the call of the President. The attempt of this bill, and of the Hay bill, is to induce the militia to participate in these trainings, and so forth, for the purpose of getting the pay provided in the bills for so doing. Any State militia that is willing to forego the pay provided for in this bill need not come in response to the call; so that it is impossible for the Federal Government, although we call it federalizing the State militia, to impose over the militia of the several States that degree of military discipline which is necessary to make an effective Regular.

Section 56 would allow that to be done. It would also do this, Mr. President: If the President of the United States is proposing some diplomatic course with some foreign power and we have not yet gone to war, but the President is apprehensive that ultimately we may get into it, although war may not be imminent under the language of the act of April 25, 1914, and he desires to prepare himself and the country for eventualities if he has to enforce his policy, or if some foreign nation is making demands upon him which he can not then disclose to the country, but which he thinks may result in an emergency, he can call for 100,000 volunteers or 200,000 volunteers, and state that, in his opinion, it is necessary under section 56 for him to do so. Everybody will then know that, in the opinion of the President, it is desirable that there should be 100,000 or 200,000 volunteers put into the field and trained. I am rather inclined to think that might have some effect in making some diplomacies more successful than the mere conducting of literary correspondence on the subject.

I want to see an army in this country that is an army and an effective one. If we can not have an army as well as a navy that can transact the business for which it exists, we ought to abolish both branches of the service and cease making any pretenses that we are doing anything to prepare this country for eventualities.

Mr. President, I was extremely sorry to hear to-day what I learned for the first time—that there had been put on the other day, as an amendment to section 56, at the end of line 2, of page 161, an amendment providing that field service under that section should only last for 30 days in any one year. Why, Mr. President, if the desire is to hamstring the section and, under color of giving the President authority to call for volunteer forces and put them into the field and train them, to pretend that they have given it when they say he can not do it for more than 30 days, of course I admit there is no use in adopting section 56 under those circumstances. The volunteers provided by that intelligent action of this body would not be nearly as well qualified to meet the emergency as the militia of the several States, for they, all parties agree, are trained at least 52 nights in the year, which would be an equivalent of 52 days' training, and this section is now limited so that these men can get only 30 days' training. They could hardly get into camp and pitch their tents and make a few evolutions before they would be required to go back home.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I do.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In that connection, I want to ask the Senator if he is not mistaken. I agree with him that the 30-day limitation ought not to be there. I think the least limitation that ought to be there is 90 days. I had contemplated offering a substitute for that provision later. I think it would be still better if the bill had been left as the committee brought it in. But does not the Senator think he is mistaken in his calculation?

The National Guard is required to meet only once a week, and it generally drills from one to one and a half hours. If you multiply whichever that is by 52, you get your result. Now, these men who will meet under section 56 have been doing very intensive work while they have been at it. They have been working not less than eight hours a day. So that when you reduce it to hours, instead of days, the Senator's calculation is wrong.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I think plainly the Senator is right and I am wrong about that; that while they were in the field 30 days they would be devoting their entire time to it, and their training would be much more intensive. But it would not be enough at all, as everybody knows, to put men into condition to do what our troops are called upon to do in Mexico now—to endure the grueling marching and countermarching day and night, the loss of sleep, the enduring of a tropical sun, the going without food, the being inured to hardship. No 30-day training could do that; and if I understand the object of this section, it is to put in the President's hands in time of peace, in case emergency comes, the possibility of developing a force which will be in training and fit to do the duty which they are called upon to perform.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I do.

Mr. STERLING. The Senator refers to this section as not authorizing the President to make a call for volunteers in time of peace but when some emergency occurs. The bill, in its terms, authorizes the President to make the call for volunteers at any time.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. It does.

Mr. STERLING. Does not the Senator think it is in contemplation that the call may be made for volunteers who may be put in training now, although there is no emergency, or although war is not imminent?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, of course I do not know what the committee intended by the use of the language. What I assume is that the President would not call for a number of volunteers, in addition to the Regular Army provided for in this bill, and in addition to what he could get if we got into war from the militia of the several States, unless there was some emergency. For the purpose of my remarks, and the purpose of establishing what section 56 proposes, as far as I am concerned, I would be perfectly willing to write into the section the words "the President, whenever in his opinion any emergency shall exist." I had not any idea but that it would never be exercised except under those conditions, although the bill does say that the President is authorized at any time to do it.

Mr. STERLING. I will simply say, Mr. President, that I inferred that that was largely the object of section 56—that we might have a large force in training, or a trained force to meet any emergency that might come hereafter, and that that was the purpose in providing for this so-called volunteer army.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I am perfectly willing that it should stand just as it is; and I will trust the President of the United States, whatever political party he may belong to, to defend the country if the section is passed as it stands. If that were done, and the President wanted to avail himself of this authority in order to prove what the country could do, if he simply did it as an experiment to find out, in case an emergency should come where he would be compelled to call for volunteers, how quickly they could be volunteered and mobilized and trained, to see what the difficulties to be encountered were, I would be willing to let him call for 50,000 volunteers and see what happened. I would like to test the sentiment of the country on that question.

A great deal has been said about our not being able to get volunteers. A great many people assume that the volunteer system would utterly break down. Others insist that the militia system would break down if called upon. I should like to see it tried. I have no doubt that if the President called for volunteers we could raise three or four regiments in the city of Chicago alone.

Another feature about this section is that these men would be enlisted for such times, and so forth, and under such conditions, as the President might prescribe. I have heard it stated, and I think it is probably true, that volunteers could be secured in the large cities for one period of enlistment and under certain conditions, and I think that in country places and in other sections of the country they could be secured for other terms and under other conditions. I see no reason why the recruiting officers of the United States, under the orders of the department, might not vary the conditions of volunteering to suit the needs of the people in the several parts of the country.

It is said that this is an experiment. It is no more of an experiment, of course, than the act approved April 25, 1914, which has never been operated under. The Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] suggests what of course would occur to any thoughtful man: "How about the headquarters? How about the encampments? How about furnishing the equipment and supplies and wagons and tentage, and so forth, for these troops?"

Mr. President, how about doing it anyway? Suppose the President calls for volunteers under the existing law. Those problems will have to be met, of course, as they arise. I assume that when Congress has authorized a thing to be done, any contracts made by the President or by the War Department for the necessary equipment would be legal, and would have to be appropriated for by Congress. They certainly would have to be provided; but the whole thing is experimental.

The Senator from New York inquires: "Is this to be a permanent army, a volunteer army, and kept up year after year, or are these men simply to be called into the service as volunteers for a year or two years or six months?"

I do not know. I do know that section 56 provides that those things are to be decided by the President of the United States.

Mr. STERLING and Mr. DU PONT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield, and to whom?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. STERLING. I should like to ask the Senator if the omission of section 13 from the provisions of section 56 would not, in a sense, answer the question as to whether or not this was to be a permanent volunteer army?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Sections 3 to 12, inclusive?

Mr. STERLING. Yes. If the Senator will observe, it is provided that the provisions of the act of 1914 from sections 3 to 12, inclusive, are to govern the volunteer army proposed to be raised under this act; but section 13 of the act of 1914 provides as follows:

That all officers and enlisted men of the volunteer forces shall be in all respects on the same footing as to pay, allowances, and pensions as officers and enlisted men of corresponding grades in the Regular Army.

Would not the omission of that section from the provisions of the present act indicate that it was not to be a permanent Army force?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Well, Mr. President, I had not given that question consideration, and I am not quite clear about it. It may be that the Senator is right about that.

Section 56, line 13, then provides as follows:

The term of enlistment, which shall in no event be greater than that of the Regular Army, the period of service with the colors and with the reserve, and the period of training shall be as the President may prescribe, those passing to the reserve to have the status and obligations prescribed for reserves of the Regular Army.

So I think the President could maintain it for years, if he wanted to, during his term, or I think he could limit it to a shorter time. However, I have not given that sufficient consideration.

Mr. President, there need be no attempt to misrepresent this question at all. There is no use in attempting to raise on the floor of this body the idea that anyone is hostile to the militia of the States. This question is before us now because the country has been clamoring for preparedness to protect the country in case it was attacked. Under the Constitution of the United States, which places the officering and the training of the militia in the States under the control of the States, I do not think in an emergency they can be successfully called upon by the President to cooperate with the Regular Army against veteran troops. When I say that I do not think I have said anything hostile to the militia of the States. They are very good bodies undoubtedly for the purposes which they are accomplishing. It may be that the kind of training they keep up and the kind of physical condition they preserve are sufficient for them to perform their duties in the States, and with the additional training they could get in being put into the service of the United States, or if they were relinquished from their daily employments as business men, bank clerks, and professional men, merchants, and storekeepers, and could have 60 or 90 or 120 days, they could very likely get in a condition for hard field service.

But the trouble is that this bill and the Hay bill contemplate treating them as though they were regular, hardened, disciplined troops, and as though they could over nightfall be called upon to cooperate effectively and efficiently with the Regular Army of the United States in competition and conflict with veteran troops, and that, in my opinion, is the deadly de-

fect of both the Hay bill and the Chamberlain bill. Excellent as I think the Chamberlain bill is in many other respects, it is absolutely fatally defective in relying upon the State militia as the first line of defense. They could with a few months' training be made a most excellent second line of defense.

So I hope most sincerely that section 56 will be retained in the bill, and I hope as fully and sincerely that the amendment which the Senate added the other day, which restricts the good it may accomplish, may be reconsidered and defeated.

Mr. REED obtained the floor.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. With the permission of the Senator from Missouri, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. SIMMONS. Before the Senator makes that motion I wish to inquire of the Senator if he has any purpose of holding night sessions for the consideration of this bill?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I will say to the Senator that unless we make rapid progress I shall probably try to have the Senate hold night sessions after to-morrow, at least.

Mr. SIMMONS. I asked the question, because I had some reason to believe it was the Senator's purpose to begin holding night sessions to-morrow night, and I thought it would be well for him now to give that notice.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, would it not be better for us before we commence night sessions to try the experiment of earlier sessions in the daytime? I think there would be very little objection to meeting at 11 o'clock.

Mr. SIMMONS. We would probably find objection to meeting earlier than 11 o'clock, and meeting at 11 would add only one hour, and it would not amount to very much.

Mr. GALLINGER. It would amount to one hour each day.

Mr. SIMMONS. By holding night session we could add three or four hours.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I wish to suggest to the Senator from North Carolina that so far most of the time has been taken up in what may be called set speeches, and I think when the question of the militia is settled there will not be so very much discussion in that way upon the bill. I thought we were getting along with the bill pretty well, and I believe myself that we shall get through with the bill within a reasonable time.

Mr. SIMMONS. What does the Senator call a reasonable time?

Mr. SMOOT. I think by the end of this week the greater part of the bill will be decided upon.

Mr. SIMMONS. I want to say to the Senator that I think every Senator here will recognize the necessity of taking up and disposing at a very early date of the so-called sugar bill.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I hope that will be disposed of.

Mr. SIMMONS. It is necessary that that bill should pass before the 1st day of May. Senators know that there is a sharp difference between the House bill and the substitute brought out by the Committee on Finance of the Senate, and by reason of that difference if the report of the Committee on Finance should be approved by the Senate there would be in conference a sharp disagreement between the two Houses. I can see how that may result in a settlement that would subject the conference report to a somewhat extended discussion in this body.

Mr. SMOOT. I realize that what the Senator says is true, and I sincerely trust that nothing will stand in the way of the passage of that bill, so that it may become a law before the 1st day of May. I myself think that if it should go over one day, instead of millions of dollars going into the Treasury of the United States it would go into the treasury of the Sugar Trust.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator is absolutely right as to the importance of passing the bill before the 1st of May.

Mr. SMOOT. I trust the bill will be passed and become a law before the 1st day of May, but I do not see any danger of its not passing by that time, even though we did not hold night sessions on this bill, because I think we have been proceeding rather rapidly with the bill.

Mr. SIMMONS. I am not agreeing to the statement made by the Senator from Utah, but I do agree to the statement that if we should allow the duty to lapse there would be a large influx of free sugar.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order. I observe that several Senators are sitting down. I think they ought all to stand up.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask for the regular order, and then I will sit down.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is moved—

Mr. SIMMONS. Before we leave this subject I wish to ask the Senator from Oregon if it should develop that we can not dispose of the pending bill within a reasonable time whether he would yield for the purpose of putting the sugar bill upon its

passage? I think, from the intimations I have received, it will take a very short time to pass that bill in the Senate.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I would be unwilling to concede that any bill could pass through the Senate in a short time. So far as I am concerned, I agree with the Senator from Utah that this bill is making fairly good progress. After the discussion of the National Guard situation I do not believe there will be very much discussion of the bill. I think Senators ought to be able to finish that discussion to-morrow, or the next day, at the latest, and then we can very quickly dispose of the bill. It seems to me that we ought to be able to dispose of it this week.

Mr. SIMMONS. Does the Senator propose to give notice of a night session to-morrow?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I hardly think it necessary to commence to-morrow. My experience here is that we do not gain much by trying to force Senators to come here at night. If I thought there was a disposition to filibuster on the bill and delay the enactment of the measure, I would feel differently about it; but I think Senators have shown a reasonable desire to get this measure out of the way, and I do not feel that we ought yet to ask the Senate to hold night sessions.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 4671) to exempt from cancellation certain desert-land entries in Riverside County, Cal.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (S. 4657) to authorize the Cincinnati, New Orleans & Texas Pacific Railway Co. to rebuild and reconstruct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Tennessee River near Chattanooga, in Hamilton County, in the State of Tennessee, and it was thereupon signed by the Vice President.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. PHELAN presented petitions of sundry citizens of Berkeley, Alameda, and Oakland, all in the State of California, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit interstate commerce in the products of child labor, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of Local Grange No. 369, Patrons of Husbandry, of Cotati, Cal., remonstrating against any change being made in the parcel-post law, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the North Congregational Church, of Berkeley, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of alcoholic liquors to Africa, and also for prohibition in the Hawaiian Islands, the Philippine Islands, and Porto Rico, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. JONES presented memorials of sundry citizens of Toppenish, Anacortes, Carrolls, Granger, North Yakima, and Wapato, all in the State of Washington, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the St. Urban Booster Club, of Winlock, Wash., praying for the creation of a system of rural credits, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of South Bellingham, Cloverland, Pipestone, and Bayview, all in the State of Washington, remonstrating against any change being made in the parcel-post law, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of the State of Washington, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to limit the freedom of the press, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented petitions of sundry citizens of Michigan, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Michigan, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to prohibit interstate commerce in convict-made goods, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. BURLEIGH presented petitions of sundry citizens of Maine, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. POINDEXTER presented memorials of Mrs. Elva Harrington and sundry other citizens of North Yakima, Wash., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of Local Grange No. 248, Patrons of Husbandry, of Sauk, Wash., and a memorial of Local Grange No. 204, Patrons of Husbandry, of Wiser Lake, Wash., remonstrating against an increase in armaments, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Ione, Carrollton, Sauk, Wiser Lake, and Custer, all in the State of Washington, praying for Government ownership of telephone and telegraph systems, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented the memorial of Archie Spence and sundry other citizens of Kennewick, Wash., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to limit the freedom of the press, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented the petition of E. E. Reynolds and sundry other citizens of Vancouver, Wash., praying for the creation of a system of rural credits, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of Cedar Grange, No. 534, Patrons of Husbandry, of Maple Valley, Wash., remonstrating against the passage of the bill (S. 2986) to provide capital for agricultural development, to create a standard form of investment based upon farm mortgage, to equalize rates of interest upon farm loans, to furnish a market for United States bonds, to create Government depositories and financial agents for the United States, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of the Humane Society of Mansfield, Ohio, praying for an investigation into the practice of vivisection, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of the New England Society, of Portland, Oreg., praying for the enactment of legislation to grant to the public-school system of Oregon 40 per cent of the proceeds from the sale of forfeited Southern Pacific grant lands, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also presented a petition of the board of governors of India House, New York City, N. Y., praying for an increase in armaments, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. TILLMAN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., praying that the prices of food be regulated by law, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

THE LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE.

Mr. NELSON, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 4425) to provide for the retirement of officers and employees of the Bureau of Lighthouses and the Lighthouse Service, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 322) thereon.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 5363) granting an increase of pension to Solomon Terpenning (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 5364) granting an increase of pension to Roxey Pierce (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 5365) granting an increase of pension to J. Augustus Thilman (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 5366) granting an increase of pension to Ira Chamberlain (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OWEN:

A bill (S. 5367) to reimburse the Women's Board of Domestic Missions, Reformed Church in America, for buildings on the Fort Sill Military Reserve, Okla.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TOWNSEND:

A bill (S. 5368) granting a pension to William M. Hammond (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HARDING:

A bill (S. 5369) for the relief of sundry building and loan associations of the State of Ohio; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BURLEIGH:

A bill (S. 5370) granting a pension to Edith A. Grover; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BORAH:

A bill (S. 5371) to provide for the procuring of rights of way for the construction of an electric power transmission line upon the Nez Perce Indian Reservation for the service of the town

of Fort Lapwai and its inhabitants and the Nez Perce Indian Sanatorium; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. O'GORMAN:

A bill (S. 5372) granting an increase of pension to Terrence Dobson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CURTIS:

A bill (S. 5373) for the relief of Charles Dade (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CUMMINS:

A bill (S. 5374) granting a pension to Jonah B. Eaton (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HUGHES:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 118) authorizing the Postmaster General to provide the postmaster of Newark, N. J., with a special canceling die for the Newark Two Hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary Celebration; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

NATIONAL DEFENSE.

Mr. SMOOT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 12766) to increase the efficiency of the Military Establishment of the United States, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. OLIVER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 12766) to increase the efficiency of the Military Establishment of the United States, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. WADSWORTH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 12766) to increase the efficiency of the Military Establishment of the United States, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. CURTIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill (H. R. 12193), which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

Mr. STERLING submitted an amendment providing for the promotion of 5 per cent of the letter carriers in second-class offices from the fifth to the sixth grade, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Post Office appropriation bill (H. R. 10484), which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and ordered to be printed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I renew my motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SAULSBURY in the chair). The Senator from Oregon moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session, the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m., Monday, April 3, 1916) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Tuesday, April 4, 1916, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 3 (legislative day of March 30), 1916.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE.

Joseph W. Woodrough to be United States district judge, district of Nebraska.

POSTMASTERS.

IOWA.

Lester R. Hudgel, Anthon.
W. H. Ward, Ryan.

KANSAS.

John C. Jones, Kanorado.
Bessie Young, Dighton.

LOUISIANA.

Jonas Rosenthal, Alexandria.

MISSOURI.

William M. Brown, Polo.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Josiah Cole, Slatington.
Joseph C. Luman, Hyndman.
John A. McGinley, Bristol.

TEXAS.

Abundio Contreras, Riogrande.

WYOMING.

A. F. Scott, Douglas.